

OXFORD

HOMER'S ALLUSIVE ART



Bruno Currie

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

HOMER'S ALLUSIVE ART

Homer's Allusive Art

BRUNO CURRIE

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Bruno Currie 2016

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2016

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016934367

ISBN 978-0-19-876882-1

Printed in Great Britain by
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

For Katrin, Hannes, and Mattis

Preface

‘The whole concept of “allusion” needs to be cleared up in Homeric studies’ (Andersen 1990: 37 n. 21); ‘[t]he whole question of archaic intertextuality needs further work’ (R. L. Fowler 2004: 230). This book is a response to these and similar calls, taking the perhaps optimistic view that ‘cleared up’ means ‘clarified’, not ‘disposed of’. It is hardly the first such response; excellent ones have been made by (for instance) Jonathan Burgess, Georg Danek, Seth Schein, and Christos Tsagalis. It is bound to be a controversial book, but I hope it will not be perceived as polemical or not excessively so. I have nevertheless tried not to shirk the duty of registering important disagreements with important scholars, who are in many cases also friends and colleagues.

Most of the material presented in this book is previously unpublished, but Chapter 2 is a heavily reworked version of ‘Homer and the Early Epic Tradition’, first published in M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie and †R. O. A. M. Lyne (eds.), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 1–45, reproduced by permission of Oxford University Press, and Chapter 3 likewise of ‘Perspectives on Neoanalysis from the Archaic Hymns to Demeter’, in Ø. Andersen and D. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 184–209, reproduced by permission of Cambridge University Press. Chapter 4 develops an idea first explored *in nuce* in *Omnibus* 57 (January 2009), pp. 25–7. Chapters 1 and 5 incorporate some material first published in ‘The *Iliad*, *Gilgamesh* and Neoanalysis’, in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry = Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes* 12 (Berlin and Boston, 2012), pp. 543–80. I would like to reiterate my thanks to those who advised me for the original publications and to record fresh thanks, for commenting on individual chapters, to Felix Budelmann, Michael Clarke, Denis Feeney, Irene de Jong, and Richard Rutherford. A special debt is owed to Jonathan Burgess, who read the whole manuscript minutely, made innumerable telling criticisms, and proposed remedies to several shortcomings. The text was also much improved by the suggestions of anonymous readers. As always, no implication of responsibility for, or endorsement of, any of my arguments accompanies these expressions of gratitude. I am also grateful to Mary Bachvarova, Georg Danek, Antonios Rengakos, Seth Schein, and Christos Tsagalis for sharing, often in advance of publication, their research with me. In Oxford I have benefited from many years of teaching early Greek hexameter poetry to some very stimulating students, and from many invigorating exchanges with my friend and colleague Adrian Kelly, a Homerist of very

different persuasion. I also had the great good fortune to learn Akkadian with Frances Reynolds. Charlotte Loveridge of Oxford University Press, to whom I once taught early Greek hexameter poetry, has guided the book through the publication process with great expertise and tact, and Donald Watt and Timothy Beck did a stellar job as copy editor and proofreader respectively. But the greatest support of all I have derived from my family, to whom the book is dedicated, in love and gratitude.

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	x
<i>Conventions and Abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>How to Use This Book</i>	xiv
1. Homer and Allusive Art	1
2. The Homeric Epics and their Forerunners	39
3. The Archaic Hymns to Demeter	79
4. Pregnant Tears and Poetic Memory	105
5. Allusion in Greek and Near Eastern Mythological Poetry	147
I. A Greek Transference: From Aphrodite to Hera	147
II. A Sumerian–Akkadian–Greek Transference: Inanna, Ishtar, Aphrodite	160
III. Mythological Catalogues, Seductions, Complaints in Heaven: Typology or Allusion?	183
IV. The Question of Awareness of Near Eastern Sources	200
V. Consequences for Greek and Near Eastern Poetry	213
6. Epilogue: Traditional Art and Allusive Art	223
Appendix A: Proclus' Summaries of the Cyclical Epics	229
Appendix B: Translation of the Berlin Papyrus (Commentary on the Orphic Hymn to Demeter)	235
Appendix C: Allusive Doublets and Incongruities	239
Appendix D: Pindar, the <i>Aethiopis</i> , and Homer	247
Appendix E: Prospective Lamentation	255
Appendix F: Typologically Generated Repetition versus Specific Reprise	259
<i>References</i>	263
<i>Index of Passages</i>	309
<i>General Index</i>	327

List of Tables

2.1. <i>Iliad</i> 24.281–508 and <i>Odyssey</i> 6.255–7.154	43
2.2. <i>Odyssey</i> 19.96–604 and a Reconstructed Alternative Homecoming of Odysseus	49
2.3. * <i>Memnonis (Aethiopis)</i> and <i>Iliad</i> , I: Achilleus in * <i>Memnonis (Aethiopis)</i> corresponds to Achilleus in <i>Iliad</i>	57
2.4. * <i>Memnonis (Aethiopis)</i> and <i>Iliad</i> , II: Achilleus in * <i>Memnonis (Aethiopis)</i> corresponds to Patroklos in <i>Iliad</i>	57
3.1. Death of Memnon in <i>Aethiopis</i> and Death of Sarpedon in <i>Iliad</i> XVI	90
3.2. Traditional Attic Version of Rape of Persephone and <i>HDeu</i>	91

Conventions and Abbreviations

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> i– (Berlin and New York 1972–).
Bekker	I. Bekker (ed.), <i>Photii Bibliotheca</i> i–ii (Berlin, 1824–5).
Bernabé	A. Bernabé (ed.), <i>Poetae epici Graeci</i> i (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1987, 2nd edn, 1996); ii fasc. 1–3 (Munich and Leipzig, 2004–7).
BNJ	<i>Brill's New Jacoby</i> , ed. I. Worthington, http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby
BNP	<i>Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World</i> , H. Canick, H. Schneider, and C. F. Salazar (eds.) (Leiden and Boston, 2002–10).
Courtney	E. Courtney (ed.), <i>The Fragmentary Latin Poets</i> (Oxford, 1993).
DDD	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> , K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst (eds.) (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne, 2nd edn, 1999).
D-K	H. Diels and W. Kranz (eds.), <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> i–iii (6th edn, Berlin, 1951).
Edelstein-Kidd	L. Edelstein and I. G. Kidd (eds.), <i>Posidonius</i> i– (Cambridge, 1972–).
EGM	<i>Early Greek Mythography</i> , R. L. Fowler (ed.) (Oxford, 2000).
ETCSL	<i>The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature</i> , http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/
FGrH	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , F. Jacoby et al. (eds.), i– (Leiden, 1923–).
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> , i– (Berlin, 1873–).
Kühner-Gerth	R. Kühner and B. Gerth, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache</i> i–ii (Hannover and Leipzig, 1898–1904).
KP	<i>Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike</i> , K. Ziegler, W. Sontheimer, and H. Gärtner (eds.), i–v (Munich, 1979).
LfgRE	<i>Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos</i> , B. Snell et al. (eds.), i–xxv (Göttingen, 1955–2010).
LIMC	<i>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</i> , i–viii (Zurich and Munich, 1981–2009).
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones and R. Mackenzie (eds.), <i>A Greek–English Lexicon</i> (9th edn, Oxford, 1940).
Maehler	H. Maehler (ed.), <i>Pindarus: Pars ii: Fragmenta</i> (Leipzig, 1989).

M-W	R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (eds.), <i>Fragmenta Hesiodica</i> (Oxford, 1967).
Pfeiffer	R. Pfeiffer, <i>Callimachus</i> i–ii (Oxford, 1949–53).
PGM	<i>Papyri Graecae magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri</i> , K. Preisendanz (ed.) (2nd edn, revised A. Henrichs) i–ii (Stuttgart, 1973–4).
PMG	<i>Poetae melici Graeci</i> , D. L. Page (ed.) (Oxford, 1962).
PMGF	<i>Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta</i> , i M. Davies (ed.) (Oxford, 1991).
Pontani	F. Pontani (ed.), <i>Scholia graeca in Odysseam</i> , i– (Rome, 2007–).
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> , i– (Stuttgart, 1950–).
RE	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , G. Wissowa et al. (eds.) i–xxiv, i.A–x.A, Supplementband i–xv (Stuttgart, 1894–1980).
RLA	<i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie</i> , E. Ebeling, B. Meissner, et al. (eds.), i–(Berlin and Leipzig, 1928–).
Rose	V. Rose (ed.), <i>Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta</i> (Leipzig, 1886).
Severyns	A. Severyns, <i>Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus</i> i–iv (Paris, 1938–63).
SH	<i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> , H. Lloyd-Jones and P. J. Parsons (eds.) (Berlin and New York, 1983).
TrGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta</i> i–v, B. Snell, S. L. Radt, and R. Kannicht (eds.) (Göttingen, 1971–2004).
van Thiel	H. van Thiel (ed.), <i>Scholia D in Iliadem. Proecdosis aucta et correctior 2014. Secundum codices manu scriptos</i> . Elektronische Schriftenreihe der Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek Köln, 7 (Cologne, 2014): http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/id/eprint/5586
van der Valk	M. van der Valk (ed.), <i>Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes</i> i–v (Leiden, 1971–87).
Voigt	E.-M. Voigt (ed.), <i>Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta</i> (Amsterdam, 1971).
Wehrli	F. Wehrli (ed.), <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> i–ii (2nd edn, Basle, 1967–9); Supplementband i–ii (1974–8).

OTHER SIGNS AND ABBREVIATIONS

- see entry in the General Index
 ⇒ see entry in the Index of Passages

>	gives rise to
<	is derived from
*	a hypothesized entity
=	a relationship of identity
~	a relationship of similarity
Σ	scholion
AO	<i>Argonautica Orphica</i>
EM	<i>Etymologicum Magnum</i>
MB	Middle Babylonian
OB	Old Babylonian
OF	<i>Orphicorum fragmenta</i>
OH	<i>Orphic Hymns</i>
SBV	Standard Babylonian version

CONVENTIONS

Greek and Roman personal names have been transliterated (but ‘Hera’, not ‘Here’, to avoid confusion), except for authors and titles of works, where the usual English forms have been used.

How to Use This Book

The chapters of this book form an interlocking argument, but each can also be read in isolation. It is in the nature of the book that certain concepts and certain passages are recurrently referred to in different, but mutually informative, contexts; in such cases, the signs ' $\rightarrow$ ' and ' $\Rightarrow$ ' are employed to direct the reader respectively to the General Index and the Index of Passages, where references to complementary discussions elsewhere in the book may be found.

Homer and Allusive Art

1.1 The Problem in Practice

Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
 οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,
 πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν
 ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν
 5 οἰωνοῖσί τε δαῖτα,¹ Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή,
 ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε
 Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.

Sing of the wrath, goddess, of Peleus' son Achilleus,
 an accursed wrath, that made countless pains for the Achaeans,
 and hurled forth to Hades many strong souls
 of heroes, and rendered their bodies spoil for dogs
 and a feast for birds, in accomplishment of the plan of Zeus—
 from the point where those two first quarrelled and were divided,
 the son of Atreus, lord of men, and godlike Achilleus.

(*Iliad* 1.1–7).

Right at the start the *Iliad* suggests more than it narrates: 'Sing..., goddess,... from the point where...'.² A starting point is indicated out of a vast potential repertoire of song known to the Muse, the poet, and presumably (some members of) the audience. The *Iliad* takes as its specific theme not the Trojan War, but the wrath of Achilleus in the tenth year of the war, for which it earned the plaudits of Aristotle and Horace.³ Yet its subsequent narrative intimates the events of the whole war: the first muster of the troops, Helene's elopement, the first clash of the armies, the death of Achilleus, the sack of

¹ This reading of Zenodotus is defended by, e.g., Latacz 2000: 19–20; *πᾶσι*, the reading of the manuscripts, and of Aristarchus, is defended by, e.g., M. L. West 2001a: 173.

² Taking 6 ἐξ οὗ with 1 ἄειδε (e.g. Kirk 1985: 53; differently, e.g. Latacz 2000: 21); cf. ⇒ *Od.* 1.10 τῶν ἀμόθεν γε... εἶπε, 1.339 τῶν ἐν γε... ἄειδε, 8.500 ἐνθεν ἐλών.

³ Aristot. *Poet.* 1459a30–b7; cf. 1451a22–35; Hor. *AP* 136–52.

Troy, and so on.⁴ Seen in this perspective, the wrath of Achilles, caused by Agamemnon's abduction of Briseis and in turn the cause of the death of many heroes, suggests the whole Trojan War, caused by Paris' abduction of Helene and in turn the cause of the destruction of the heroes.⁵ There are grounds, then, to think that the *Iliad*'s proem connotes the story of the Trojan War. Just the story, though? Or does it actually allude to previous tellings of the story in hexameter verse? That possibility becomes more tangible once we observe similar phrasing in other early Greek epic poems on the Trojan War. The *Cypria* told of how Zeus caused the Trojan War to ease Earth's overburdening and of how 'the heroes began to be killed at Troy in accomplishment of the plan of Zeus' (fr. 1.6–7 Bernabé οἱ δ' ἐνὶ Τροίῃ / ἥρωες κτείνοντο, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή). The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* tells in the context of the Trojan War of Zeus' intending that 'the bronze should hurl away to Hades many heads of heroes as they fell in battle' (fr. 204.118–19 M-W π[ολλὰς Ἀΐδῃ κεφαλὰς ἀπὸ χαλκὸν ἰάψ[ει]ν / ἀν[δρῶν] ἡρώων ἐν δηϊότητι πεσόντων). The *Iliad* itself speaks ten books later of Zeus as intending 'to hurl forth to Hades many strong heads' (Il. 11.55 πολλὰς ἰφθίμους κεφαλὰς Ἀΐδι προΐαψειν), and an ancient variant attested by Apollonius of Rhodes at Il. 1.3 reads 'and hurled forth to Hades many strong heads of heroes', with κεφαλὰς for ψυχάς, bringing the three passages still closer together.⁶ It might be conjectured that such phrasing was already used in hexameter poetry before the *Iliad* in the context of a plan of Zeus to annihilate 'the heroes'.⁷ In deploying such phrasing in the context of Achilles' anger at Agamemnon for his abduction of Briseis in the tenth year of the war, the poet would then more concretely signal how his restricted theme is modelled on the whole Trojan War. A disconcerting yet perspicuous 'plan of Zeus', a population control measure (*Cypria* fr. 1 Bernabé; compare Enlil's plan in the Babylonian poem *Atrahasis*), would have been transformed into something even more unsettling and enigmatic in the *Iliad*.⁸

On this view, the non-Homeric passages cited (*Cypria* fr. 1 Bernabé, 'Hes.' *Cat.* fr. 204.118–19 M-W) are taken to offer reflexes of earlier poetry to which the *Iliad*'s proem will be alluding. It is precisely this kind of possibility that this book will be concerned to justify in principle and to illustrate in practice. It involves various assumptions: that there was abundant Greek hexameter poetry preceding the *Iliad*; that the poet of the *Iliad* and (some of) his audience knew (some of) that poetry; that we, too, may occasionally glimpse that earlier

⁴ Kullmann 1960: 365–7; J. Griffin 1980a: 1; Dowden 1996: 55–6; Schein 1997: 352–5; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 44, 105–6, 118; Rengakos 2015a: 155–6.

⁵ The parallelism between the abductions of Helene and Briseis is made explicit by Achilles, Il. 9.339–41. Trojan War as a means to the heroes' destruction: Hes. WD 264–5, 'Hes.' *Cat.* fr. 204.98–100 M-W, *Cypria* fr. 1; cf. Eur. *Hel.* 23–41.

⁶ Il. 1.3 κεφαλὰς, if read, would cohere badly with 4 αὐτοὺς δέ (M. L. West 2001a: 173).

⁷ Redfield 1979: 101 = 2001: 465; Scodel 1982: 46–7; M. L. West 2011a: 82.

⁸ R. L. Fowler 2004: 230. *Cypria* and *Atrahasis*: Burkert 1992: 100–4; M. L. West 1997: 481–2.

poetry, however dimly; that Homer alludes to it; and that he does so, typically, in order to highlight differences in his own approach. It is very suggestive that the very first lines of the *Iliad* already raise this possibility; if accepted, it would follow that the possibility must be reckoned with in the rest of the poem as well. This book will in fact argue that allusion of this sort to earlier poetry is a significant feature not just of the *Iliad*, but also of other early hexameter poetry, the *Odyssey* and the 'Homeric' *Hymns*. The presence of allusion to earlier poetry in the proem of the *Iliad* would be interesting for another reason, too: it is well known that the proem of the *Aeneid* alludes to those of the *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, that the proem of *Paradise Lost* alludes to those of Virgil's and Homer's epics, and so on; it would be arresting to find that the *Iliad* in its proem alludes to earlier poetry as well, and in comparable ways—if Homeric allusion, to some extent, resembled Virgilian.

We have here, however, got some way ahead of ourselves. There are, of course, serious problems with interpreting the first lines of the *Iliad* in this way. Whether we should think of the *Iliad* as alluding to a specific earlier poem is unclear, rather than to an indeterminate number of fairly undifferentiated earlier poems which had used these or similar phrases in connection with the Trojan War. There are more radical doubts as well: did such earlier poetry really exist? Could an early Greek audience have known of it, if so? It was supposed in the preceding that other early Greek epics (*Cypria*, *Catalogue of Women*) preserve the older, more traditional, context to which the *Iliad* alludes; it could equally be other way round.⁹ Or is it wrong to posit any first occurrence from which the others depend? It is pointed out that it was standard in early hexameter poetry to indicate that the poem's action happened by 'Zeus' will'.¹⁰ The phrase and the idea can therefore be argued not to be associated with any particular poem or any particular context.¹¹ One might suppose that there was a pool of traditional phrases and ideas to which poets would recur and could refer their audiences (the phenomenon of 'traditional referentiality', to which we will turn presently), but that they did not recur to

⁹ So M. L. West 2013: 57, 68, on *Il.* 1.5 and *Cypria* fr. 1.7 Bernabé.

¹⁰ *Il.* 1.5b = *Cypria* fr. 1.7b Bernabé = *Od.* 11.297b Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή; cf. *Od.* 8.82, *HDem* 9, etc. R. L. Fowler 2004: 230 n. 40 'the recurrence of the phrase ... makes one suspect that it is a traditional equivalent to "the plot of this epic"'; cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 145; Murnaghan 1997: 25 n. 3; Allan 2008: 213–14; Petropoulos 2012: 297–8.

¹¹ Allan 2008: 210, 212 'the *Dios boulê* evokes a totality of stories characterized by Zeus's dominance, but does so without referring to specific texts'. However, a 'plan' or 'deliberation' (*sic*, not 'will') of Zeus to destroy the heroes is a distinctive, full-bodied, and developed motif in the narrative of the *Cypria* (fr. 1 Bernabé, Summary Bernabé p. 38, l. 4; cf. *Eur. Hel.* 36–7, fr. 1082 *TGrF*) and the *Iliad* (8.470–7, 15.61–77, 19.270–4; cf. 3.164–5, 6.356–8, 11.79). Similar are the deliberations of Enlil to destroy mankind in the Babylonian *Atrahasis* (OBV I.352–60, III.iii. 36–9; = Foster 2005: 239, 250). These three texts (*Atrahasis*, *Iliad*, *Cypria*) are connected with one another thematically by a plan of Zeus/Enlil to destroy men in a way quite distinct from the vague generic sense in which any epic action occurs *eo ipso* by the 'will' of Zeus.

or refer their audiences to earlier poems or earlier poetry. Our example thus embroils us in a large controversy, which is central to this book. We must now step back from this specific example in order to explain the controversy and, more properly, the book.

1.2 Allusive Art, Traditional Art

The book's title conflates the titles of two very different and influential works: G. Pasquali's 'Arte allusiva' and J. M. Foley's *Homer's Traditional Art*. Pasquali's brief article, published in 1942, mainly addressed Latin poetry; but Pasquali insisted that allusion is much older than the Hellenistic age, that Homer too 'alludes', and that allusion is not just a parlour game in vogue in literary cliques.¹² Foley's book of 1999, complemented by numerous earlier and later studies, treated Homer alongside South Slavic and Old English poetry, arguing that Homer employed a technique of 'traditional referentiality' typical of oral poetry, and cautioning against the assumption that Homer alluded in the manner of literary poets.¹³ These two approaches continue to inform contemporary Homeric scholarship, though the former approach, which I have linked to Pasquali, is often sceptically regarded. *Homer's Allusive Art* contends that Homer does not only operate with a traditional art in Foley's sense, but also with an allusive art in Pasquali's sense that can be illuminated by comparison with unambiguously literary poets.

Foley's position asks us to reflect on two propositions, one general, that oral poetry does not allude like poetry in a literary tradition, but employs traditional referentiality; the other specific, that the Homeric epics in particular employ traditional referentiality either exclusively or characteristically.¹⁴

The first proposition, that traditional referentiality is the only mode of referencing in an oral epic tradition, appears to have the double underpinning of common sense and investigated oral traditions. On the one hand, common sense seems to dictate that long poems that are orally composed, orally performed, and orally transmitted are by their nature too evanescent to be the object of specific allusion.¹⁵ However, it cannot be assumed a priori that in a given oral tradition there are not sufficiently fixed texts to ground allusion,

¹² Pasquali 1951 (1942): 20.

¹³ J. M. Foley 1999: 27 'terminology of "allusion" and "oblique reference", to which we as textually trained scholars are driven, bespeaks our lack of acquaintance with the mode of signifying via traditional signs'. Cf. J. M. Foley 1991: 57. For the coining of the term 'traditional referentiality', cf. *ibid.* p. xiv. The concept goes back to A. B. Lord (Lord 1960: 148).

¹⁴ Danek 2002b: 5 interprets Foley as considering traditional referentiality 'characteristic of every type of oral-traditional epic'.

¹⁵ As summed up by Danek 2002b: 3, 'To put it simply: no texts, no intertextuality'; cf. Danek 1998a: 13.

nor need allusion necessarily demand a very high level of textual fixity. On the other hand, empirically investigated oral traditions have usually meant, for most Homerists, South Slavic oral poetry, of which A. B. Lord asserted: 'In the Yugoslav tradition stories are kept separate and, to the best of my knowledge, singers never refer in one song to the events of another.'¹⁶ More recently, J. M. Foley and J. Arft have reiterated that 'the [South Slavic] song-performances collected by Parry, Lord, and Vujnović did not speak directly to one another, and they were most certainly not related intertextually'.¹⁷ Yet these assertions have received significant qualifications. G. Danek argued for the need to distinguish in this respect between the Bosnian (Muslim) and the Serbian (Christian) strands of this tradition. On the one hand, 'Bosnian epic seems to confirm the idea that the only kind of intertextual relations to be found in oral-traditional epic is what Foley calls "traditional referentiality"', and '[i]t is never necessary to know a concrete song or a concrete story in order to understand another story'.¹⁸ On the other hand, according to Danek, in Serbian epic 'there are some impressive examples where an audience is assumed to be acquainted with a myth which lies outside the text'.¹⁹ Danek concluded: 'Serbian epic thus employs precise references to individual stories or parts of stories. I believe that, even in an orally-based epic tradition directed at a generally illiterate audience, it is thus proven that intertextual references are possible which go beyond the evocation of a generic model.'²⁰ Z. Čolaković, moreover, has detected specific allusions and cross references even in Bosnian epic: Avdo Međedović's *The Wedding of Vlahinjić Alija* alludes to his *Chieftain Gavran and Serdar Mujo*, and a similar situation is indicated for the songs of Murat Kurtagić.²¹ Čolaković observed that '[m]any [sc. Bosnian heroic] songs are completely incomprehensible, unless one knows many other songs within the region in question'.²² Part of the problem here, of course, is that the detection of allusion even in fully literate traditions is never a scientific matter; one interpreter may, quite legitimately, see an allusion where another, equally

¹⁶ Lord 1960: 159. ¹⁷ J. M. Foley† and Arft 2015: 86.

¹⁸ Danek 2002b: 12; cf. Danek 1998a: 18–19, picking up the discussion of *ibid.* 7–11.

¹⁹ Danek 2002b: 12. The example discussed by Danek 2002b: 12–15 (cf. Danek 1998b: 89–90) is Filip Višnjić, *The Beginning of the Revolt Against the Dahijas* (Karadžić 1841–62: iv no. 24 lines 96–106 = Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 280–1). We might add *Marko Kraljević and Mina of Kostur* as alluding to *The Wedding of King Vukašin* (Karadžić 1841–62: ii no. 62 lines 61–79 and no. 25 lines 134–52; Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 182, 185 n. 42); and Filip Višnjić's *The Battle on Mišar* as alluding to *Tsar Lazar and Tsaritsa Milica* and to *The Death of the Mother of the Jugovičs* (Karadžić 1841–62: iv no. 30 lines 1–189, ii no. 45 lines 119–204, and ii no. 48 lines 57–84; Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 299, 300 n. 54). Danek 1998a: 19–21; 2002b: 18–19 attributes this difference between the Serbian and Bosnian tradition to the historical perspective present in the former but absent the latter.

²⁰ Danek 2002b: 15. Cf. Danek 2002c: 22 n. 20.

²¹ Čolaković 2006: 169.

²² Čolaković and Rojc-Čolaković 2004, in Danek 2005c: 280 (translated). Cf. Danek 2005a: 19 n. 43; 2010b: 125. Elmer 2010 takes issue with Čolaković's characterization of Međedović as a 'post-traditional' poet.

legitimately, may not.²³ It is, moreover, difficult to be expert in one epic tradition, let alone several. Many Homerists would defer to expert opinion on the South Slavic heroic epics (though no more unanimous than on the early Greek epic tradition itself) in order to interpret Homeric poetry in its light. But is this not to put the cart before the horse? Arguably, we do not need formulations about South Slavic epic or oral epic in general to tell us what early Greek epic is (not) capable of. Rather, early Greek epic, if found both to be oral and to employ specific allusion, should be allowed the capacity to show us what oral epic is capable of, in one, perhaps limiting, case at least.²⁴

The truth of the second proposition, that the Homeric epics employ traditional referentiality (either exclusively or characteristically) follows simply on the truth of the first, granted that Homeric poetry is 'oral poetry'; but the sense in which Homeric poetry is 'oral poetry' needs to be clarified. Many scholars would see writing as playing a part in the composition of the *Iliad*.²⁵ For his part, Foley always insisted that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were not to be viewed as 'oral', but 'oral-derived traditional texts'.²⁶ In this they would more closely resemble *Beowulf*, the *Nibelungenlied*, and the *Chanson de Roland* than the South Slavic oral epics.²⁷ Foley was thus readier than some scholars, notably A. B. Lord, to countenance 'transitional texts', to concede the compatibility of orality and literacy.²⁸ Here it is recognized that a purely oral Greek epic poetry is not attested in our extant texts, though the existence of a purely oral Greek epic poetry at an earlier unattested stage is not doubted.²⁹ It is curious that a scholar

²³ Edmunds 2001: p. xvii, citing E. Miner: 'The test for allusion is that it is a phenomenon that some reader or readers may fail to observe.'

²⁴ In this vein, Finnegan 1977: 152 emphasizes the need for empirical study of particular traditions, rather than theorizing about the behaviour of oral tradition in general.

²⁵ e.g. Lohmann 1970: 211–12; 1988: 76–7; Lloyd-Jones 1990 (1981); Garvie 1994: 16 and n. 51; Reichel 1998; R. L. Fowler 2004: 230–1; Rösler 2011: 208; M. L. West 2011a: 10–11; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 32 and n. 104; Kullmann 2015: 108.

²⁶ J. M. Foley 1990: 5, 14; 1991: p. xv, 22; 1995: 63; 1997a: 163; see esp. J. M. Foley 2011a. Other terms to describe the mixed nature of the Homeric poems: Čolaković 2006: *passim* 'post-traditional'; Sale 1996a: 24 'oralistic' (as opposed to 'oral') epic; Honko 2000: 7 'tradition-oriented'; R. L. Fowler 2004: 222 'transitional text'.

²⁷ However, we should not think of even the South Slavic songs as produced in a purely oral environment: Finnegan 1974: 57; Katičić 1998: 17, 22–3; Čolaković 2006: 178–9. Contrast J. M. Foley 1990: 3; Amodio 2005: 204.

²⁸ J. M. Foley 1999: 45; 1995: 63; 1997b: 59–60; Bakker 1997: 22, 23. Cf. Danek 2002a: 18, on the Bosnian singer Ćamil Kulenović, who wrote down his poems in the oral-traditional style, as disproving the thesis of M. Parry and A. B. Lord that a traditional singer lost his traditional style when he learned to write; cf. A. Parry 1966: 183, 213–16 = 1989: 109, 136–40. Differently, Lord 1960: 147: '[Homer] is not a split personality with half of his understanding and technique in the tradition and the other half in a parnassus of literate methods'; cf. *ibid.* 128–32, 149; Lord 1953: 131; Jensen 1980: 89–92; Nagy 1990b (1982): 40. Lord later modified his position (Lord 1995: 212–37), though not for Homer (*ibid.* 236); Janko 1998a: 3; Dukat 1998: 325.

²⁹ To refer to extant early Greek hexameter poetry as 'the pre-textual stage of early Greek epic' (Allan 2005: 14; 2008: 206) is problematic. Cf. M. L. West 1981: 58 = 2011b: 151 on the use of the phrase 'extant oral Greek epic'.

who would save the 'traditional oral idiom' for 'oral-derived texts' should exclude the allusive idiom from those texts.³⁰ Precisely the concept of 'oral-derived' poetry left the door open for the recognition of both distinctively oral (or 'traditional') and distinctively written techniques, assuming these *are* distinctive techniques. Foley indeed argued for such inclusivity of approach: 'Even when, in oral-derived and transitional texts, we are presented with mixed signals for the decoding of textual structures—with some oral traditional and some quite literary responses called for—it will be a mistake to level this hybrid character to the smooth surface of denotative, post-traditional, purely textual signification.'³¹ It ought to be an equivalent mistake to level this hybrid character to the smooth surface of purely oral, traditional-referential signification.³²

Foley's concern, of course, was with the traditional-referential model, whose operation he sought to illustrate in the Homeric epics, among others. He was interested in the capacity of oral-derived texts to continue to function in the manner of oral poems, preserving their oral traditional poetics.³³ However, this concern is at times responsible for a slippage from Foley's own declared position (the Homeric poems as oral-derived texts) to Lord's position (the Homeric poems as oral poems). One sign of that slippage is Foley's argument, inherited from Lord, that the Homeric poems were produced by dictation on an external stimulus, the only apparent rationale for which is to save a purely oral conception of these poems.³⁴ There is no reason why an oral-derived text should not have been written by the poet himself or, if dictated, dictated on the initiative of 'insiders' of the tradition.³⁵ Another sign of the same slippage is the exclusion of specific allusion from the Homeric epics. The possibility of specific allusion ought not to arouse consternation in the context of an oral-derived poetry with its 'hybrid character'. It is open for those who regard the Homeric epics as oral-derived poems to see them as employing traditional referentiality characteristically, but grounds for claiming that they do so exclusively are hard to see. It remains to be shown whether they in fact employ traditional referentiality more characteristically than they employ specific

³⁰ The exclusion is most explicit in J. M. Foley† and Arft 2015: 78–9, 83–4, 95.

³¹ J. M. Foley 1991: 57–8. Cf. *ibid.* 5–6: 'What we might expect to emerge... is an oral traditional poetics that will share some of its features with literary poetics but will differ in other features'; 15 '[the term and concept "oral-derived"] allows us to examine the traditional features of the work alongside its post-traditional characteristics'. Cf. J. M. Foley 1997: 163; 2011c: 608–9.

³² Cf. Mueller 2011: 741–2: 'It is likely that many interdependent repetitions result from a hybrid technology in which conventions of oral composition blend in new and sometimes awkward ways with the opportunities and conveniences offered by the new text technology of writing.'

³³ J. M. Foley 1997a: 163, 170–1; 1990: 5; 1995: 60–98, 137; 1997b: 61–2; J. M. Foley† and Arft 2015: 82–3; Amodio 2005: 204–5.

³⁴ J. M. Foley 2005a: 209; cf. 211; 2011b; Lord 1960: 152. Critiqued: Bakker 1997: 22.

³⁵ See § 1.4, pp. 21–2.

allusion. And it is another open question whether even 'purely' oral poems are by their very nature incapable of specific allusion.³⁶

Of course, we do not have to choose between traditional referentiality and allusion; we may embrace both.³⁷ To plead the case for 'Homer's allusive art' is not to impugn the case for traditional referentiality, the value of whose contributions, especially in illuminating apparently non-traditional applications of traditional language and uncovering conventionally conferred connotations, is not here in dispute.³⁸ One notable success of Foley's approach is to rescue the 'ornamental' epithet from meaninglessness, showing how, attractively, formulas can be chosen '*artis causa*, not *metri causa*'.³⁹ An arguable defect, however, is the absence of an attempt to balance the models of traditional referentiality and specific allusion. And an equivalent criticism might be levelled at this book. It might, for instance, have been possible to balance Foley's reading of the *Hymn to Demeter* in terms of 'traditional art' with my own reading of the same poem in Chapter 3 in terms of an 'allusive art'.⁴⁰ Yet, however desirable a synthesis or rapprochement may be, it is necessary for the respective approaches first to be illustrated and vindicated in their own right. Such vindication is clearly needed in the case of specific allusion, which is viewed with suspicion in much contemporary Homeric scholarship. But it needs to be clear that vindication of the one approach entails no necessary denigration of the other: the two approaches are not mutually exclusive, and their integration may become a proper concern of scholarship once the validity of each seems sufficiently secure.

It is a further question to what extent there are distinctively oral-traditional and distinctively written techniques, and to what extent 'traditional referentiality' fundamentally distinguishes oral from written poetry.⁴¹ In the words of one reviewer of Foley:

The traditional rules that F[oley] uncovers... are rules of oral-traditional poetry; this is axiomatic for him, since he does not offer comparative analyses of strictly literate poems. But his critics may well ask here, 'What if Virgil etc. also follow these very rules? And especially—what if Lucan or Statius follow them? Is it not possible that F[oley] is simply uncovering rules for composing epic—oral or oral-

³⁶ Dowden 1996: 60. ³⁷ So e.g. Danek 2002*b*: 17; 2005*a*: 19; Kelly 2007: 12.

³⁸ e.g. Sacks 1987: 3–4, 7, 8, 12; J. M. Foley 1997*a*: 168–9 and 1998: 171 (on the purely conventionally conferred connotations of *ὑπόδρα ἰδών* and *πυκνὸν ἔπος*); Kelly 2007: 4 and *passim*.

³⁹ J. M. Foley 1999: 7. Cf. J. M. Foley 1991: 142–3, on *πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς* (cf. Sale 2001: 70–1; Danek 2002*b*: 6; Graziosi and Haubold 2005: 51–3); 1995: 150–60, on *κρατὺς Ἀργεϊφόντης*.

⁴⁰ J. M. Foley 1995: 136–80.

⁴¹ J. M. Foley 1990, on a 'need for a new poetics'; cf. Lord 1995: 202 'on the level of aesthetics, one needs to know whether a text is oral traditional or not in order correctly to apply the criteria of referentiality. There is a difference between oral traditional poetics and written poetics.' On the question whether we need a special 'oral poetics', cf. Kirk 1976: 69–85; J. Griffin 1980*a*: pp. xiii–xiv; Janko 1998*a*: 11; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 28–9.

derived or written—in a given language?’ ... In any case, we need to know whether strictly literate writers follow the same rules.⁴²

Others have noted the resemblance of Foley’s concept of ‘traditional referentiality’ to J. Kristeva’s concept of ‘intertextuality’.⁴³ The concept, in other words, would not be so much a peculiarity of oral-traditional poetry as a function of literature generally. The arguments over whether to recognize traditional referentiality or specific allusion in Homer can be compared with arguments over whether to recognize a *topos* or specific allusion in Latin poetry.⁴⁴ S. E. Hinds has defined the *topos* in Latin poetry in terms reminiscent of traditional referentiality: ‘rather than demanding interpretation to a specific model or models, like the allusion, the *topos* invokes its intertextual tradition as a collectivity, to which the individual contexts and connotations of individual prior instances are firmly subordinate.’⁴⁵ Latin poetry, Hinds shows, employs both the *topos* and specific allusion. So too, many would now agree, does fifth-century Greek drama.⁴⁶ The assumption of advocates of the traditional-referential approach is that Homeric epic is made special by its use of traditional referentiality.⁴⁷ The worry is that we may rather end up impoverishing Homeric poetry if we regard it as capable of only the one form of referencing.⁴⁸

1.3 Typology and Allusion

There are, of course, difficulties with seeing specific allusion in early Greek epic as there are not in Latin poetry or even Attic drama. The existence

⁴² Sale 1996*b*.

⁴³ Danek 1998*a*: 14; 2002*b*: 8; Holmberg 1998: 456, 474; I. C. Rutherford 2012: 155.

⁴⁴ Cf. Hinds 1998: 34–47. ⁴⁵ Hinds 1998: 34.

⁴⁶ Tragedy: allusion to tragic *topoi*: R. B. Rutherford 2012*a*: 359, 399–400; cf. Easterling 1982: 21–2. Prime candidates for specific allusion to other tragedies are Eur. *El.* 487–584 (Cropp 1988: 134–41; Torrance 2013: 13–33) and Eur. *Phoen.* 751–2 (Mastronarde 1994: 360–1; cf. 9–10, 393; Torrance 2013: 94–129). Specific allusion in tragedy: Gregory 2005: 267–8; Garner 1990; Halleran 1997; Markantonatos 2007: 195–230; R. B. Rutherford 2012*a*: 360–1. Comedy: allusion to comic *topoi*: e.g. Ar. *Ran.* 1–2, *Pax* 734–5, 741–7, *Nub.* 538–43, *Acharn.* 628–9, *Eq.* 507–9, *Thesm.* 785. Allusion to specific comedies (and tragedies): Biles 2011: 134–66; Storey 2003: 291–300; Bakola 2010: 16–24; Wright 2012: 90–102.

⁴⁷ e.g. Dué 2002: 2: ‘the very fact that the *Iliad* is “oral traditional” often allows even deeper and more complex levels of meaning than may be found in poetry that is composed in a literate, text-based culture’.

⁴⁸ Sale 1996*a*: 24: ‘Adam Parry complained as long ago as 1971 that many an oralist was impoverishing the text by disallowing interesting interpretations on the grounds that no oral poet could have thought of them, and Anne Amory Parry engaged Albert Lord in a scholarly duel over this issue. This is not to deny that gratifying readings can be *added* by conceiving of the text as orally composed; but when clever interpretations are *subtracted* by this process, critics are naturally irked.’

of a common stock of phrases, motifs, and themes in early Greek hexameter poetry problematizes the attempt to identify specific allusion. Thus G. Nagy has said, 'when we are dealing with the traditional poetry of the Homeric (and Hesiodic) compositions, it is not justifiable to claim that a passage in any text can refer to another passage in another text'.⁴⁹ The problem is perhaps not so much that it is not justifiable to claim that they can as that it is not easily demonstrable that they do.⁵⁰ It is not easily demonstrable that a specific allusion is being made for the simple reason that even what presents itself a single recurrence among our texts may always be considered an underrepresented formula or other typical element.⁵¹ Hence it is open for oralists to claim as typical motifs what neoanalysts would claim as 'transferred motifs'.⁵² And so in general oralists' preference for 'typology' jostles with neoanalysts' preference for 'stemmatic' relationships of 'primary' and 'secondary' contexts of use.⁵³

Dichotomous thinking here, as with traditional referentiality and specific allusion, is again specious; there is room, of course, for both typical motifs and transferred motifs.⁵⁴ But a dichotomy would be spurious also for a more crucial reason: we must allow for interplay between the typical (formulaic) and the specifically allusive. It may be that we cannot even define the typical (or formulaic) in theory or identify it in practice without recourse to the specific reprise: a formula is a repetition that is not a specific reprise. According to M. Parry:

When the element of usefulness is lacking, one does not have a formula but a repeated phrase which has been knowingly brought into the verse for some special effect. Thus the definition [*sc.* of the formula] excludes the refrain... The definition likewise excludes the echoed phrase... Non-formulaic too is the verse which is borrowed because the poet's public knows it and will recall its former use... Finally a poet will often repeat a phrase after an interval in order to obtain some special effect.⁵⁵

⁴⁹ Nagy 1979: 42. Responses: Taplin 1990: 109 n. 2; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 125; Danek 1998a: 14 n. 24; Burgess 2006a: 163–4; 2009: 56–7; as well as Nagy himself: 1998: 79–80.

⁵⁰ So Hoekstra 1969: 8; Blößner 1991: 11–12. Similarly, G. P. Edwards 1971: 189, cited by Nagy 1979: 42, spoke only of such relationships between texts as being 'impossible to prove', but remained open to the possibility of a passage in one text depending on a passage in another (cf. *ibid.* 207, on 'imitation').

⁵¹ See, e.g., Mueller 2009: 154; Cantilena 2012: 84–5. But the opposite assumption is also fully viable: cf., e.g., Blößner 1991: 12 'wenn ein Iteratum überhaupt nur zweimal im frühgriechischen Epos begegnet, so ist seine Formelhaftigkeit zunächst eher zu bezweifeln'.

⁵² See Fenik 1968: 236, 239–40; Hainsworth 1969: 30; Hoekstra 1969: 8; Janko 1982: 225–6; M. W. Edwards 1990: 311–12. This is not to imply that neoanalytical and oral positions are intrinsically irreconcilable: cf. Kullmann 1984 = 1992; Danek 1998: 24–5; Burgess 2006a: 158.

⁵³ See, on these concepts and issues, Burgess 2006a; 2009: 56–71.

⁵⁴ e.g. M. W. Edwards 1991: 11–19.

⁵⁵ M. Parry 1971: 272–4 = 1930: 81–3.

Parry recognizes various types of 'repeated phrases', including what I would call (specific, unidirectional) allusion. But as well as defining the formula against the 'repeated phrase', we need to recognize the interdependence of the two. Formulas, we may take it, are created from repeated phrases.⁵⁶ And, conversely, formulas may be turned (back) into specific, allusive reprises. The latter occurs when the specific use of a formula or type-scene in one context is evoked by the use of the same formula or type-scene in another, related context.⁵⁷ It is, of course, never straightforward or uncontroversial to recognize when this has happened; but the case is there to be argued wherever the use of a formula or type-scene in context can be shown to be marked and the postulated relationship between the two occurrences to be meaningful. In the most convincing cases it is appropriate to abandon a typological explanation for the repetition and accept the likelihood of a specific reprise. This step is in general easiest to take for repeated elements within a single poem ('intratextuality').⁵⁸ But it is hard to see the grounds for refusing the further step from there to repeated elements across different poems ('intertextuality'). If specific reprise is possible over thousands of lines within a single poem, why then not across different poems, whether by the same poet or by different poets?⁵⁹

Arguments for allusion, then, are certainly capable of coexisting alongside recognition of the typicality of Homeric epic.⁶⁰ That said, arguments for allusion may be thought particularly compelling when they involve repeated elements that appear to be non-typical or non-formulaic.⁶¹ But there is no necessary tension between allusion and typology. To the extent that such a tension sometimes emerges in practice, it cuts both ways: just as arguments for the presence of a type-scene or formula have the potential (but no more) to undermine arguments for allusion, so do arguments for allusion have the potential to undermine any automatic assumption of typicality or formulaicity.⁶² Still, the relationship in general is better conceived as fluid and symbiotic than an exclusive and competitive one.⁶³

⁵⁶ Hainsworth 1993: 6: 'The phrase is repeated and becomes a formula because it is useful'; cf. *ibid.* 16, 17 on 'the process of becoming a formula'.

⁵⁷ Schwabl 1982; Pucci 1987: 35; Taplin 1990: 112; Usener 1990: e.g. 12, 210; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 140 n. 42.

⁵⁸ Heubeck 1974: 148–9: 'Die formelhafte Diktion ist aus einem Hilfsmittel für improvisierende Gestaltung an vielen Stellen zum Träger poetischer Funktionen geworden; wiederkehrenden Wortgruppen, Formelverse, Versgruppen können und sollen im Zusammenhang des Ganzen Erinnerungen wachrufen, gedankliche und inhaltliche Linien, Kontraste und Parallelitäten deutlich werden lassen.' Cf. Schwabl 1986: 43–4, 59; 1990: 99; M. W. Edwards 1980: 27; Willcock 1990a: 4, 9, 11; de Jong 1991: 413–17; Mueller 2009: 28–30.

⁵⁹ Cf. Schwabl 1982: 14, 18, 32–3; A. Parry 1971: *liv*; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 126; P. V. Jones 1997: 36–7; Kelly 2007: 12 nn. 41–2; Burgess 2009: 64. See Appendix F, p. 262.

⁶⁰ Fenik 1968: 237: 'Typical composition and direct influence are not incompatible.'

⁶¹ The approach of Usener 1990 (cf. 7–8); Kullmann 1991: 444–5 = 1992: 120.

⁶² Schwabl 1982: 17; Mueller 2009: 153–72. ⁶³ See Appendix F.

1.4 Allusion and Fixed Texts

There are quite various ways of conceiving allusion in early Greek epic; none need be exclusive of the others, though they differ essentially in what they identify as fixed enough to serve as an object of allusion. Traditional referentiality is one model, which looks to 'the Tradition' as fixed enough to serve as an object of reference (that is to say, to conventional uses of, for instance, formulas and type-scenes).⁶⁴ Another model, 'mythological intertextuality', takes the mythological tradition as the fixed reference point.⁶⁵ Another model again takes a 'simple story' (defined as 'the deducible *Urgeschichte* of a concrete narrative, its *Urform*'), as a notional fixed reference point against which all concrete tellings of a traditional story can be measured.⁶⁶ Alongside these is the model that will be primarily defended in this book, according to which individual poems may be fixed enough to serve as an object of allusion.⁶⁷

This model has seemed uncongenial to many, although, interestingly, not uniformly across the range of early Greek hexameter poetry. Thus, while many scholars are reluctant to grant that the *Iliad* may allude to specific earlier poems, several are content to allow that the *Odyssey* alludes to the *Iliad*, that the *Works and Days* alludes to the *Theogony*, that the *Catalogue of Women* alludes to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, or that various of the *Hymns* allude to other specific early Greek hexameter poems.⁶⁸ Those prepared to accept some or all of these must face the question of what makes the *Iliad* sufficiently different to justify taking a fundamentally different stance to that poem. The *Iliad* does not seem to be substantially more oral-traditional than the other poems.⁶⁹ If it boils

⁶⁴ J. M. Foley 1991: 7 "Traditional elements reach out of the immediate instance in which they appear to the fecund totality of the entire tradition." 'Tradition' with a capital T: Janko 1998a: 7; Clay 1983: 243.

⁶⁵ Burgess 2012a: 168; 2006a: 154, 173; 2009: 56. Cf. Willcock 1983: 485 n. 8; Dowden 1996: 51.

⁶⁶ Quotation from Hölscher 1988: 27 (translated). Cf. *ibid.* 26, defining the 'simple story' (*einfache Geschichte*) as 'das pragmatische Gerüst einer Handlung, die Fabula'. Danek 2002c: 22 n. 20: 'I think we can grasp here an important aspect of a typical "oral" kind of intertextuality, the allusions referring neither to "texts" in the modern sense, nor to typology, but to the idea of a "story-line."' Danek 2005a: 15 n. 29.

⁶⁷ Dowden 1996: 48: 'I think it is worth envisaging a stronger case, where Homer interacts with specific implementations of the standard story'; 50 '[Homer] evoked particular stories at particular points for particular effect and could well have had particular tellings, "texts", in mind.' Cf. Danek 1998a: 484 '[die Odyssee hebt] sich nicht nur gegen die potentielle "einfache Geschichte", sondern gegen konkrete epische Versionen dieser Geschichte [ab]'. Danek 2002b.

⁶⁸ On the *Catalogue*, Ormand 2014: 119–80. On the *Hymns*, O. Thomas 2011; Brillat-Dubois 2011; Olson 2012: 16–24, 279–81; Faulkner 2008: 31–4, 35–8, 38–40; Baumbach 2012: 137–8; Hunter 2012: 94.

⁶⁹ On the respective degrees of orality/traditionality of the poems, cf. G. P. Edwards 1971: 190–1; N. J. Richardson 1974: 31, 337–8; Janko 1982: 18–19, 40–1; J. M. Foley 1995: 145–6, 164; Faulkner 2008: 25.

down simply to the fact that our evidence for ‘sources’ of the *Iliad*, as our earliest extant poem, is much scantier than for the others (in the case of the *Odyssey*, we at least have the *Iliad*), then the problem emerges as one of evidence rather than of principle.⁷⁰

Yet there is, of course, a principled objection to the model of poem-to-poem allusion in early Greek epic: specific allusion between poems presupposes the existence of sufficiently fixed texts to allude to, and the concept of a fixed text in an oral tradition is thrown into question by the phenomenon of (re)composition in performance observed for South Slavic singers by A. B. Lord.⁷¹ The application of this observation to the Homeric epics has seemed straightforward. Thus S. L. Schein has argued, ‘the poetic tradition of these [sc. the Homeric] epics was oral and hence... there was no fixed text of an earlier epic from which Homer could borrow’.⁷² However, Lord’s model has been challenged even for South Slavic song by Z. Čolaković, finding among the best singers of the Bosnian heroic epic tradition an interplay between improvisation and memorization, with some compositional elements being handled ‘freely’, others in a ‘fossilized’ manner.⁷³ And R. Finnegan and others have emphasized the existence of oral poetic traditions outside the Balkans where ‘near word-for-word reproduction’ was important.⁷⁴ Finnegan insisted that the fluidity of one oral poetic tradition cannot be inferred from the fluidity of another; each tradition requires to be approached on its own terms.⁷⁵ We need to know how much fixity there was in the early Greek epic tradition, where to situate the products of this tradition on a spectrum ranging from free (re)composition in performance to rigid, quasi-verbatim reproduction of fixed texts.⁷⁶

It is necessary to distinguish the question of variation in oral transmission (i.e. reperformance) from that of variation in the textual tradition.⁷⁷ This distinction has important, and asymmetrical, implications: variations in

⁷⁰ Dowden 1996: 48.

⁷¹ Lord 1960: esp. 99–101, 149; Garvie 1994: 6 and n. 17; Martin 2011a.

⁷² Schein 1984: 28. Cf. Burgess 2001: 133. The problems posed for allusion by the absence of a ‘fixed text’ are discussed by Andersen 1990: 44–5; Danek 1998a: 6, 13; D. L. Cairns 2001: 35; R. L. Fowler 2004b: 228.

⁷³ Danek 2005c: 281, on Čolaković and Rojc-Čolaković 2004: 293–4.

⁷⁴ Finnegan 1977: 73, 75, 144, 148; 1974: 60; Thornton 1984: 14–18. On the whole this goes for ‘shorter forms of poetry’, rather than ‘lengthy epic poetic narrations’ (Finnegan 1977: 78; Lord 1981: 459–60).

⁷⁵ Finnegan 1977: 152. Cf. J. M. Foley 1998: 150–1; 2005b: 55–7 (‘comparison must always be tempered by contrast’).

⁷⁶ Finkelberg 2000: 6: ‘The problem... is that, as distinct from the medieval and the South Slavic epics, we have no clear idea of the degree of variation allowed in Greek epic tradition itself.’ A relatively high degree of stability is assumed by Kirk 1960: 278–9; Dowden 1996: 47–8, 49–50; 2004: 188; D. L. Cairns 2001: 36.

⁷⁷ Powell 2007: 13–14; A. D. Morrison 2007b: 115 n. 9. Compare and contrast, e.g., Nagy 2011: 281.

poems as performed will not have had an obvious impact on the textual record; but texts, if used by performers, must have checked the variation that occurred in performance. That is, the poems experienced by audiences in performance are bound to have been subject to fluctuation; even poems learned by heart by rhapsodes cannot have been verbatim reproductions of the written texts.⁷⁸ But still, the presence of written texts is bound to have conferred greater stability than on a purely oral scenario of (re)composition in performance.⁷⁹ Moreover, if the poets used written texts, their ability to make allusions can have exceeded the (average) audience member's ability to perceive them.

There are some putative indications of the levels of fixity-fluidity of poems as performed in the early Greek epic tradition. The first nine lines of the fourth and the eighteenth poems in our corpus of *Homeric Hymns* have been seen as independent attempts to recreate the 'same' passage of a hymn to Hermes, and thus as indicative of the kind of variation to be expected in the performance of early Greek epic in its historical phase.⁸⁰ We may see these either as independent 'recordings' of two separate performances or, probably preferably, as two instances of rhapsodes reproducing written texts from memory.⁸¹ It is possible to emphasize the divergence between these two versions. Thus one scholar notes, 'only three lines are shared, exactly, between them'.⁸² On the other hand, the correspondence is extremely close: crucially, we seem obliged to recognize this as a situation where the poem 'is conceived of as a more or less fixed entity, with its own wording' and 'is itself transmitted as a verbal entity', rather than the situation generally assumed for 'oral traditional epics', where 'what is remembered is a story and/or themes' and where 'a poem, or song, means a story, not a given set of words, not a given text'.⁸³ There would seem to be little difficulty in making allusion to a poem whose text fluctuated within these parameters. Here our discussion is seen to turn on two key indeterminacies. First, the detection of fluidity or fixity is often subjective and

⁷⁸ Rhapsodes learning by heart: Xen. *Symp.* 3.5, *Mem.* 4.2.10; Plat. *Ion* 530b10–11, 537a4; cf. *Leg.* 810e12. For Homer in general being learned by heart, cf. Verdenius 1971: 6–7.

⁷⁹ Čolaković 2006: 181: 'One of Parry's Bosniac singers learned [a poem from a written source] by heart word-for-word, with close to 90% accuracy, though it is over 2,000 verses long.' Cf. M. L. West 1997: 600.

⁸⁰ *HHerm* 1–9 and *HHom* 18.1–9 thus regarded: Hainsworth 1988: 29–30; cf. Janko 1982: 3; Cantilena 1982: 241–2. Differently, M. L. West 2003c: 4–5, 18, seeing *HHom* 18 as an 'excerpt' from *HHerm*. The manuscript tradition of *HHom* 10 presents a similar picture (Olson 2012: 291). Cf. *HAp* 146–50, ⇒ 165–72, as preserved in the direct and indirect (Thuc. 3.104.3–6) tradition: Janko 1982: 2–3, 233–4; Aloni 1989: 110; N. J. Richardson 2010: 104.

⁸¹ In favour of the first option, cf. Janko 1982: 3: 'These cases show that versions of what is essentially the same poem could undergo substantial change, apparently by oral transmission involving some recomposition: these versions appear to be different recordings of the same underlying *Gestalt*.'

⁸² Hainsworth 1988: 30.

⁸³ Quotations from Lord 1995: 20.

relative; it is normal for one interpreter to see fluidity where another sees fixity.⁸⁴ Second, fixity and fluidity are vague terms; fixity is not all-or-nothing.⁸⁵ 'Between the two extremes of total fixity and utter fluidity lie various levels of semi-fixity.'⁸⁶ It is unclear how much fixity of text we may minimally require for specific allusion to be possible. But something well short of total fixity (exact verbatim reproduction) will suffice, especially where an allusion operates more on the level of motif or narrative structure than of phrasing.

The very existence of discrete poems in the early Greek hexameter corpus is called into question by the 'evolutionary model' influentially and controversially proposed by G. Nagy, positing a fluid transmission of early Greek epic throughout the archaic period and viewing variation in the textual tradition as reflecting ongoing composition in performance of the poems.⁸⁷ To this evolutionary model various types of objection have been made.⁸⁸ First, that it has not been established that variants in the Homeric textual tradition in fact reflect the multiforms of a performance tradition.⁸⁹ Second, that the extraordinary qualities that we find in the Homeric epics were bound to have been lost if Homer's songs had been left solely to singers to perpetuate, rather than being fixed straightaway in a written form.⁹⁰ Third, that a fundamental

⁸⁴ Scodel 2002: 43: 'From outside, it is impossible to know just how divergent songs that were recognized as "the same" could be.' Lord 1985: 321: 'I must say that I find Cope's summary comparison of the two versions of Hamu's praise poem rather inadequate. When he says, for example, ... "the first two lines correspond," he does not mean that they are identical, and I invite the reader to compare the texts and the translations for himself.' Goody 1987: 87: 'When we examined the different versions of the White Bagre recited by Sielo in 1975, ... [my collaborator] was surprised at Sielo's inconsistency, whereas I was struck by the similarities. In any case, we were a long way from verbatim reproduction.'

⁸⁵ Cf. A. Parry 1966: 189 = 1989: 115: 'This brings us to the vital question which no one has yet confronted clearly: what is the essence of the *Iliad*? How much would our vulgate text have to be changed before a reasonable student would have to say: "This is no longer the *Iliad*, it is a song sung in much the same style, treating of similar themes"? To this question no precise answer can be given. But until we are ready to give it some kind of answer, we have no right, I submit, to talk about *accuracy of reproduction*; for to talk about such matters at all, we must have some clear and rational notion of what is, or is not, being reproduced.'

⁸⁶ Dowden 1996: 48. Cf. Lord 1995: 20, 39–40, 212: 'more or less' fixed texts.

⁸⁷ Homer: Nagy 1996a: 29–63; 1996b: 107–52; 2004; 2012: 39–46; cf. Burgess 2001: 10–11; Dué 2009: 24–5; Dué and Ebbott 2010: 19–20.

⁸⁸ Janko 1998a: 12 n. 63; Finkelberg 2000; Blümer 2001: i.23–91; Scodel 2002: 61 and n. 43; Pelliccia 2003; R. L. Fowler 2004: 224–5; Reece 2005; Andersen and Haug 2012: 7.

⁸⁹ Finkelberg 2000; cf. Janko 1998b: 206; M. L. West 2001a: 11, 159 n. 2; 2001 = 2011b: 178; 2004; R. L. Fowler 2004: 231 and n. 47; Powell 2007: 13–14; Rengakos 2011: 168. Pelliccia 2003: 114–15 n. 36 instructively compares ancient variants in the tradition of other authors that do not imply an ongoing performance tradition.

⁹⁰ Danek 2012b: 41–2, esp. 42: '[M.] Parry's model of a comparison between Homer and the legendary *Āor Huso* misses the mark, since the specific quality of his performance was already no longer visible after a single generation of oral transmission of the epics in the songs of his successors. Thus the model of Nagy, viz. the gradual fixation of the form of the text over several generations of purely oral transmission, can be ruled out as unlikely: Homer's text was only able to remain preserved in its outstanding quality because the succeeding singers were able to be guided by the textually fixed form. The *Mededović* model offers a better analogue here: Homer's

difference between rhapsodes and singers (ᾄδοι) must be recognized: the rhapsodes who reperformed Homeric poetry in the archaic period did not practise composition-in-performance, but operated with a clear concept of a fixed text, which they aimed to reproduce faithfully.⁹¹ Fourth, that the linguistic evolution of the extant early Greek hexameter works was arrested at a fixed point in time: most suggestive, perhaps, is the finding that for both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and for *Theogony* and *Works and Days* the second of the pair emerges as consistently more developed across a range of linguistic features, whereas, if the texts represented ongoing performance traditions, it should not be possible thus to identify older and younger compositions among them.⁹² Fifth, and the objection most germane to this book, that the significant allusive relationships are one-way: for instance, the *Odyssey* alludes significantly to the *Iliad*, but not vice versa; and the *Works and Days* alludes significantly to the *Theogony*, but not vice versa.⁹³ This finding, too, if granted, deserves respect. If fixed texts are a precondition for specific, unidirectional allusion, so the demonstration of specific, unidirectional allusion, if it can be made, will imply the presence of fixed texts in this tradition. In short, nothing prohibits us from believing in discrete and sufficiently stable poems, some of which would be capable of alluding to others, rather than multiform 'traditions' reciprocally influencing each other throughout the archaic period.⁹⁴ That is not to say that there was never contamination between what continued to be fundamentally discrete poems; but such contamination may have been a marginal and fairly contained phenomenon, and needs to be argued on a case-to-case basis, not taken for granted.⁹⁵

text obviously only remained preserved for posterity because it was frozen in book form' (translated). Cf. A. Parry 1966: 182–3, 189–201 = 1989: 108–9, 115–26; R. L. Fowler 2004: 224; Čolaković 2006: 162–9, 179.

⁹¹ Pelliccia 2003; cf. Powell 2007: 41–2. Differently, Nagy 1990*b* (1982): 42; 1996*b*: 112–13; 2004: 79; Burgess 2005*b*: 127; Martin 2005: 167 and n. 38.

⁹² Janko 1982; 2012; 1998*a*: 12 n. 63; cf. R. L. Fowler 2004: 225; Haslam 2011: 849–50. Criticisms of Janko's method: e.g. Olson 2012: 10–15; M. L. West 2012: 227–8.

⁹³ *Odyssey* and *Iliad*: see § 2.1. *Works and Days* and *Theogony*: Pucci 1977: 140–1; Rowe 1978: 104, 110; Janko 1982: 195; Verdenius 1985: 15; Most 1993: 76–91; Blümer 2001: esp. i.93–106, ii.137–200, ii.64; Scodel 2012: 512. Differently, Clay 2003: 6, 8.

⁹⁴ Nagy 1990 (1982): 79: 'Instead of referring to a *poem* in such a context, it would be better to speak in terms of a *tradition of performing a certain kind of poem*'; Nagy 1990*a*: 53–4 n. 8. Cf. Tsagalis 2008: 63 n. 2, 110, 146, 136; also Burgess 2001: 5, 11–12; 2006*a*: 148 n. 2; 2009: 2; Dué 2002: 2–3 n. 6; Marks 2008: 12–13; Cook 2009: 137. *Contra*: Danek 2012*a*: 121: '[the Iliadic *Doloneia*] proves the case that we are entitled to discuss chronological relations between different works in archaic epic, i.e. between texts with fixed wording, and not just story traditions'. (Differently, on the *Doloneia*: Dué and Ebbott 2010: 19–20; Bierl 2012*a*: 137–8.)

⁹⁵ See § 2.1, pp. 39–40 on the question of contamination between *Odyssey* and *Iliad*. Cross-fertilization between *Aethiopis* and *Iliad*: Willcock 1973: 8–9; Cook 2009: 137. Between *Cypria* and *Iliad*: Tsagalis 2008: 110. Between *Catalogue* and *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: Ormand 2014: 119–20. In general, Scafoglio 2004*b*: 295. Note, differently, Burgess 2001: 132–71, supposing little influence of the Homeric epics on the Cyclical epics.

Nagy's evolutionary model, incompatible with specific unidirectional allusion, is nevertheless accommodating to a very differently conceived bidirectional intertextuality.⁹⁶ (This version of intertextuality has also been dubbed 'intertraditionality', since it involves interaction not between—relatively fixed—*texts*, but between—fluid, evolving—*song-traditions*.⁹⁷) This conception of early Greek epic intertextuality enjoys popularity, but is not the subject of this book.⁹⁸ It is entirely likely that our extant early hexameter texts were each preceded by several poems on the same theme, and that these poems may have interacted with others on different themes, and vice versa. But we can and should also allow in this picture for (relatively) fixed texts that became the source- and target-texts of specific unidirectional allusion. In practice, as this book will aim to show, we will often want to say of many motifs or phrases that recur in different poems that one alludes to another, rather than that each alludes equally to the other. Moreover, with two texts A and B (say, the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*) there will often be a clear direction of influence: we will want to say, not that A alludes to B approximately as many times as B alludes to A, but that, overwhelmingly, A alludes to B. It is telling that a number of scholars theoretically disposed to find bidirectional intertextuality have in practice ended up seeing one text as alluding to the other rather than vice versa.⁹⁹ Specific unidirectional allusion between relatively fixed texts on this showing emerges as the dominant form of allusion, to which bidirectional intertextuality plays a subsidiary role.

It has been doubted 'that the Homeric poems know of other "fixed" poems', 'that they consciously recall these poems by quoting specific lines'.¹⁰⁰ One response is to say that the poet of the *Iliad* (and likewise the poet of the *Odyssey*) knows his own poem as a fixed text, and recalls parts of it by quoting specific lines. This is most strikingly seen with speeches.¹⁰¹ It is not difficult to

⁹⁶ Bakker 2013: 158 n. 1 sees Nagy's evolutionary model as 'providing a climate favorable to conscious quotation'; cf. 169.

⁹⁷ Tsagalis 2014b: 396.

⁹⁸ See Pucci 1987; Nagy 1990a: 53–4 n. 8; 1998: 79–81; Tsagalis 2008. Cf. Marks 2005: 13–14; Brillet-Dubois 2011: 131–2; Barker and Christensen 2014: 250–1.

⁹⁹ Note Pucci 1987, as critiqued by Burgess 2009: 57: 'Theoretically, the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* are said to "read" one another, but in practice usually the *Odyssey* is described as reacting to the *Iliad*. This suggests a later historical date for the *Odyssey* or, in the very least, assumes a secondary status for this poem—although such conclusions are denied.' Cf. Cook 1995: 4; Ormand 2014: 119–20, and 14.

¹⁰⁰ Barker and Christensen 2008: 5. Cf. Burgess 2001: 133; Allan 2005: 14.

¹⁰¹ An impressively long-range example is *Od.* 4.333–50, reprised at 17.124–41. In general, Lohmann 1970; and cf. Young 1967: 311–13; Mueller 1984: 150, 158; 2009: 165; M. W. Edwards 1987a: 23; de Jong 1987: 179–94. Differently, Clark 1997: 160, seeing here a 'technique of composition through the repetition of a large chain of formulas'; but a 'chain of formulas' is unlikely to show the necessary stability: Hainsworth 1993: 21. Our manuscripts may distort the degree of correspondence upwards (Janko 1990: 332–3; cf. Lord 1962: 195; 1995: 213) or downwards (Eide 1999: 113–14); but the limited parameters within which this may have occurred will not affect the main point.

imagine the 'sense of text' with which the poets operate here carrying over into their engagement with other poems.¹⁰² Hesiod in the *Works and Days* seems pointedly to engage with the *Theogony*, which he evidently knows as textually fixed, and probably fixed by writing.¹⁰³ The same is likely to be true of the *Odyssey's* engagement with the *Iliad*.¹⁰⁴ The *Iliad* is often argued to draw on existing hexameter narratives that had already attained a degree of textual fixity: for instance, in the Catalogue of Ships, the Embassy to Achilles, and the Catalogue of Nereids.¹⁰⁵ Our conception of the oral-derived poetry operating in our extant early Greek hexameter texts must accommodate some recall of elements of fairly fixed texts, though not necessarily 'memorization' of fully fixed texts.¹⁰⁶

If we allow that portions of specific text could be reprised from memory, not necessarily with exact verbatim accuracy, the status of the text recalled remains unclear.¹⁰⁷ It may be understood as coming from a particular, clearly defined poem.¹⁰⁸ Or it may be understood as the property of the tradition at large, without 'belonging' to any individual poem.¹⁰⁹ The question here is partly whether there was a concept of the clearly defined poem in the early Greek hexameter tradition. Could a poem attain sufficient prominence to become a 'classic', or were all compositions evanescent?¹¹⁰ There is a related question of the level of → self-consciousness a poem could possess about its own place in tradition. A parallel question concerns the prominence of individual poets in early Greek hexameter poetry. Nagy's evolutionary model, which prefers to speak not of a 'poem', but of a 'tradition of performing a certain type of poem', sees poets not as historical authors, but

¹⁰² 'Homer's Sense of Text' is the title of Dowden 1996.

¹⁰³ *WD* 11–26 and *Th.* 223–32; Scodel 2001: 122; and cf. Most 1993: 77–80; 2006: xxi; Blümer 2001: ii.35–8 (differently, Sinclair 1932: 3; Hooker 1992: 50–1; Zarecki 2007: 11–14). Hesiod and writing: Most 1993: 82; 2006: xxi–xxii; cf. M. L. West 1981 = 2011b.

¹⁰⁴ Usener 1990: 207; Kullmann 1991: 444–5 = 1992: 120–1; 2002: 154–5 = 1995: 51–2. See § 2.1.

¹⁰⁵ Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.484–760): Scodel 2002: 72; cf. Kullmann 2002 = 1993; 2009: 17; Mueller 2009: 175; with qualifications, Danek 2004: 63–6; cf. Sammons 2010: 137–9. Embassy (⇒ *Il.* 9.182–98): cf. Hainsworth 1993: 87; D. L. Cairns 2001: 36; Mueller 2009: 9. Catalogue of Nereids (*Il.* 18.39–49): Nieto Hernández 2011; M. W. Edwards 1991: 149; cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 287.

¹⁰⁶ Heubeck 1974: 147; Austin 1975: 20–1, 259; Austin 1991: 229–30; Dowden 1996: 59; Scodel 2002: 41; Danek 2005c: 281; Blößner 2006: 19 n. 2, 20 n. 3 (compare and contrast Lord 1991a: 80–1). A. B. Lord dealt repeatedly with improvisation, memorization, remembering, composition in performance, and (relative) fixity of text: see Lord 1960: 58–63; 1985: 337–8; 1991a: 88–9; 1991b: 185; 1995: 11, 57–8, 62, 197–200, 167–82, 212–13.

¹⁰⁷ Danek 2010a: 237 'We have seen ... how specific texts achieve an extra meaning if they are related to other "texts" ... What status did these "texts" have?'

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Dowden 1996: 59.

¹⁰⁹ Burgess 2006a: 154; 2012a: 183; cf. Burgess 2001: 154; 2009: 61. Cf. Schein 1984: 28. See § 3.8, pp. 102–3.

¹¹⁰ Burgess 2012a: 170: 'Most oral poems would not have been performed so often as to influence other poems, or be the object of allusion.'

as personifications of the ‘tradition’.¹¹¹ To what extent did authors in this tradition assert ‘proprietary rights’ in their compositions?¹¹²

A well-known passage around which such issues crystalize is *HAp* 166–73:

170 χαίρετε δ' ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι· ἐμεῖο δὲ καὶ μετόπισθε
μνήσασθ', ὅπποτε κέν τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
ἐνθάδ' ἀνείρηται ξεινὸς ταλαπείριος ἔλθων·
ὦ κούραι, τίς δ' ὕμνιν ἀνήρ ἥδιστος αἰοιδῶν
ἐνθάδε πωλεῖται, καὶ τέω τέρπεσθε μάλιστα;
ὑμεῖς δ' εὖ μάλα πᾶσαι ὑποκρίνασθαι ἀφήμους·
τυφλὸς ἀνὴρ, οἰκεῖ δὲ Χίῳ ἐνι παιπαλοέσση·
τοῦ πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριστεύουσιν αἰοίδαί.

Farewell, all of you [maidens of Delos], and remember me also hereafter,
when someone of men upon the earth,
a weary stranger, comes here and asks,
‘O maidens, what man is the sweetest of singers in your eyes
who frequents here, and in whom do you take most pleasure?’
All of you without exception make answer without giving my name:
‘A blind man, he lives in rocky Chios;
all of his songs are the best hereafter.’

It is not possible here to enter fully into the controversies of the passage; my interpretation largely follows that of W. Burkert.¹¹³ Lines 171–3 serve to inscribe, pseudonymously, Homer’s authorship in the text; the first-person speaker of the *Hymn* identifies himself as Homer ‘anonymously’ (171 ἀφήμους), that is, by antonomasia, rather than by giving his name.¹¹⁴ The circumlocutions ‘a blind man, he lives on Chios’ (172), ‘the sweetest of singers’ (169), and ‘his songs are the best hereafter’ (173) are evidently meant as uniquely identifying descriptions of Homer. We have here an antonomastic *sphragis* of the ‘Cean nightingale’ type (Bacchylides 3.97–8). It is understood that the poet thus namelessly introduced is anything but an anonymity. We can hardly be in any

¹¹¹ Nagy 1996a: 20–2, 92–3; cf. 1990b (1982) 47–51, 79; Lamberton 1988: 1–37; J. M. Foley 1998: 149, 169; 2004: 186. Differently, Most 1993; Scodel 2002: 28–9; Pelliccia 2003: 105–9; R. L. Fowler 2004: 227 and n. 28; A. D. Morrison 2007a: 57 with n. 108, 58, 60, 61, 66–7.

¹¹² Hainsworth 1993: 36. Cf. Scodel 2002: 59–60 esp. 59: ‘It is not the case... that performers in oral epic traditions cannot see their works as intellectual property’; Dowden 1996: 48 ‘A fixed text is more visibly owned and authored, and whoever borrows it owes an acknowledgement.’

¹¹³ Burkert 1979: 53–8 = 2001: 189–93 and M. L. West 1999: 368–72 = 2011b: 414–21. Cf. Graziosi 2002: 62–6; N. J. Richardson 2010: 13, 109; Nagy 2011; Sbardella 2012a: 86–9.

¹¹⁴ On ἀφήμους, see Burkert 1979: 61 = 2001: 196; 1987: 55 = 2001: 214–15; Aloni 1989: 112; differently, Carey 1980; N. J. Richardson 2010: 110. By contrast, the author-narrator of the *Theogony* at 22–4 ‘*Ἡσίοδον ... με*’ (cf. Virg. *Geo.* 4.563 *Vergilium me*) identifies himself by name (*φήμους, as it were).

doubt that the constructed speaking persona is 'Homer', self-advertising and celebrity-conscious at that.¹¹⁵ Homer's blindness, his Chian origins, and his pre-eminence as a singer must then be assumed to be established elements of his biography and reception by the time of this hymn. The emphatic inscription of Homer's authorship in the *Hymn* should be understood in terms of Chian Homerid rhapsodes' wish to be taken to be repeating the *ipsissima uerba* of Homer: the presence of Homer's first-person *sphragis* is supposed to guarantee that this is so.¹¹⁶ We are asked to believe, moreover, that this is so after a long interval of time. In 173 and 166, μετόπισθε(ν) introduces a *post euentum* prediction: what the author-narrator, 'Homer', anticipated as a future prospect is now seen to be fulfilled in the *Hymn*'s late sixth-century reperformance and reception.¹¹⁷ It does not matter that we—and evidently some ancient readers—can easily penetrate the pseudonymous fiction.¹¹⁸ What is important for our purposes is that the hymn, thus interpreted, testifies to sixth-century rhapsodes' profession faithfully to preserve the precise text of a poem that is emphatically attached to a specific author, an author so famous his name need not be mentioned.¹¹⁹ As it happens, we know that this poem, its *sphragis* section specifically, was not transmitted with complete verbatim accuracy. That is a nice irony, but one that does not fundamentally affect the point being made: we are dealing not with substantial alteration introduced during free oral recomposition-in-performance,

¹¹⁵ See Mueller 2009: 12–13, emphasizing the competitive individualism of the passage. Similar, though not anonymous or antonomastic, is the *sphragis* of the celebrity-conscious Theognis (22–3).

¹¹⁶ The Homeridai appear to have passed off as 'of Homer' several works hitherto unknown to the wider public; cf. Plat. *Phaedr.* 252b4–5 ἐκ τῶν ἀποθέτων ἐπῶν, with Yunis 2011: 155: 'ἀπόθετος refers to items that are unknown to the public because they are held in reserve or secret'. Many such works may in fact have been composed by the Homeridai themselves; cf. Σ Pind. N.2.1c.

¹¹⁷ The *post euentum* prediction at the end of the 'Delian' section of the hymn balances the *post euentum* prophecy at the end of the 'Pythian' section, *HAp* 540–3. (On the unity of *HAp*, see N. J. Richardson 2010: 10–13; Faulkner 2011: 12; differently, Chappell 2011.)

¹¹⁸ Σ Pind. N.2.1c; Athen. 1.22b (Thucydides, 3.104.5, perhaps believed the fiction.)

¹¹⁹ My interpretation follows M. L. West 1999: 370 = 2011b: 417: 'Evidently he claimed to be reciting *verbatim* a hymn composed by Homer many generations earlier... After all, whenever a rhapsode recited Hesiod's *Theogony* or *Works and Days*, the audience must have understood and accepted that the references to "I" and "me" meant the original author, Hesiod, and not the rhapsode who was uttering the words.' Compare and contrast Janko 1982: 115: 'The pious fraud is at once comprehensible, indeed familiar, in an oral tradition, where poets may claim to be singing the song of a great predecessor, while altering that predecessor's song substantially during free oral recomposition-in-performance.' West's scenario of verbatim recitation by a rhapsode differs from Janko's scenario of free oral recomposition-in-performance by a poet-singer. For the situation alluded to by Janko, cf. Finnegan 1977: 53: 'a Somali reciter often makes it clear to his audiences that the poem he is delivering was composed not by himself but by another named poet'; J. M. Foley 1999: 51–2: '[the *Guslar* / "Isak" / "Hasan Čoso's"] songs were regarded by the Stolac *guslari* as the finest that had come down to them... [T]hey were unanimous in crediting the *Guslar* as the ultimate source for the best songs they knew.'

but with minor alteration introduced in the context of the concerted attempt to reproduce a fixed (and, in this case, written) text.¹²⁰

HAp 166–73, on this interpretation, presupposes the conception of a fixed text as the intellectual property in the first instance of an individual author, Homer, and subsequently as the carefully safeguarded property of associations of his self-styled heirs, the Homeridai. This situation with Homer and Homeridai appears to replicate itself with Kreophylos and Kreophyleioi, and Hesiod and Hesiodeioi.¹²¹ We would, of course, love to know how far back in the tradition such a conception of authorship goes.¹²² The Hesiodic poems give a strong sense of an author asserting ‘proprietary rights’ in his compositions.¹²³ Hesiod’s authorship is declared in the proem of the *Theogony* (lines 22–34, especially 22–4), a passage protected from suspicion of interpolation by the cross reference at *WD* 658–9 (unless we are willing to condemn both passages as un-Hesiodic). This situation generates a whole series of controversy-laden questions: how critical is writing for the creation of the concept of the poem and of the poet?¹²⁴ What level of concern for oral fixed texts preceded the creation of written fixed texts?¹²⁵ Was the impulse to create written texts intrinsic or extrinsic to the poetic tradition?¹²⁶ In other words, does the textualization of these poems reveal something essential to this tradition or something

¹²⁰ Rhapsodes, as learned and bookish (Xen. *Mem.* 4.2.10, *Symp.* 3.5–6), must be accorded a different level and conception of verbatim accuracy than the South Slavic singers discussed by Lord 1960: 27–8 and A. Parry 1966: 187–8 = 1989: 113–14. See esp. Pelliccia 2003: 103. On the textual variation introduced by rhapsodes (→ rhapsodic variation), see M. L. West 2001a: 15 and n. 35. The situation with ⇒ *HHerm* 1–9 and *HHom* 18.1–9 is similar.

¹²¹ In general, see Burkert 1972: 79–80 = 2001: 143–4 (differently, Nagy 1990b (1982): 51; Graziosi 2002: 201–34; Scodel 2002: 57–60; R. L. Fowler 2004: 227 n. 28. Homeridai: M. L. West 1999 = 2011b: 2001a: 15–17; Graziosi 2002: 208–17; Andersen 2011. Kreophyleioi: Burkert 1972: 77–8 = 2001: 141–2. Hesiodeioi: Beaulieu 2004: 112–13; Currie 2007: 190 n. 150; differently, Cingano 2009: 98; Nagy 2009: 307. For the interpretation of the inscription from Thespieae, *IG* VII.1785 (= Roesch 1982: 127 no. 7 = Most 2006: 234 T104), the comparison with *IG* VII.1790 (= Roesch 1982: 126 no. 6) is decisive.

¹²² Burkert 1972: 79 = 2001: 143, on the antiquity of Homeridai and Kreophyleioi. M. L. West 1999: 364 = 2011b: 408 considers that ‘[interest in the identity or the person of the author or authors of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*] only arose in the last decades of the sixth century’.

¹²³ Differently, Nagy 1990b (1982) 47–51, 79; Lamberton 1988: 1–37.

¹²⁴ Cf. Most 1993; 2006: xxi–xxii, on Hesiod and the Hesiodic poems.

¹²⁵ Mueller 2009: 176: ‘the concept of a fixed text does not depend on writing’; Tsagalis 2011: 235 and n. 86, esp. 238–9.

¹²⁶ Lord 1960: 152: ‘I feel sure that the impetus to write down the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* did not come from Homer himself but from some outside source’; Lord 1953: 130; 1962: 197; Jensen 1980: 92–3; 2000: 61; J. M. Foley 2005a: 209; 2011b: 604. Differently, Goody 1987: 93: ‘the text we possess was written down by insiders ... It is only recently, in general, that outsiders (as distinct from insiders) came and recorded oral forms, as Parry and Lord did in Yugoslavia’; cf. A. Parry 1989: 111 = 1966: 185; Austin 1975: 22–3, 259–60 n. 28; Garvie 1994: 17; Bakker 1997: 20. Contrast here the ‘analogy of modern-day oral epic’ adduced by J. M. Foley 2005a: 209 with the ancient Greek analogues (Hesiod, the lyric poets, Herodotus) adduced by R. L. Fowler 2004: 224–6.

incidental to it?¹²⁷ When was the alphabet introduced, and how well established was literacy when the Homeric poems were set down in writing?¹²⁸ Must they have been dictated?¹²⁹ Were these poets making use of written texts of other poems, whether they were able to read these for themselves or needed to have them read out to them?¹³⁰ These questions are of the sort whose answers reveal a critic's individual preferences more than anything else. But the difficulty of answering them should not stymie an investigation into Homeric allusion, nor should the burden of proof be assumed to fall on those who would posit a scenario of fixed texts and allusion more than on those who would deny it.

1.5 An Expanded Neoanalysis

Allusion in Homeric scholarship has tended to be explored under the umbrella of neoanalysis, several of whose methods and conclusions will be defended in this book.¹³¹ It needs to be said that the term 'neoanalysis' is potentially misleading.¹³² Neoanalysis is not a revival of analysis, but conceived as a refutation of it, drawing unitarian conclusions from analytical starting points, namely, the observation of inconcinnities in Homeric narrative.¹³³ Nor should neoanalysis be supposed to be a 'new' way of approaching the Homeric poems. H. Pestalozzi and J. T. Kakridis in the 1940s are recognized as the modern founders of neoanalysis, but they were hardly the first to read Homer that way.¹³⁴ Some ancient scholars read Homer 'neanalytically'. The very insistence of Aristarchus on other epic poets being 'younger' than, and derivative on, Homer presupposes the existence of an opposite, neanalytically minded, party, perhaps including Zenodotus.¹³⁵ The D-scholion on *Il.* 1.5 Διὸς δ'

¹²⁷ Haslam 1997: 79–84; Scodel 2002: 57–8; R. L. Fowler 2004: 230–1.

¹²⁸ Contrast Powell 2007: 52: 'Homer's texts must have come into being close to the invention of the alphabet around 800 BC' with Rösler 2011: 201–2, 208 (the alphabet introduced soon after 800 BC and the Homeric poems committed to writing c.100 years later).

¹²⁹ Objections to the dictation theory: Bakker 1997: 20–6; Danek 2007: 617; cf. Čolaković 2006: 184. Dictated, but by a literate poet: Kullmann 2002: 173 n. 59; cf. Reichel 1998: 1 n. 1 (differently, Lord 1960: 149).

¹³⁰ Čolaković 2006: 177–9; cf. 181.

¹³¹ Neoanalysis and 'intertextuality' in Homer: Dowden 2004: 201; Burgess 2006a; Bakker 2013: 157.

¹³² Kullmann 1991: 425–6 = 1992: 100 renames neoanalysis 'die motivgeschichtliche Forschung' ('the study of the history of motifs', in Homer).

¹³³ Blößner 2006: 20 n. 6; cf. J. T. Kakridis 1949: 8; Kullmann 1955: 253 = 1992: 38; Burgess 2001: 61.

¹³⁴ Cf. Burgess 2001: 213 n. 44; 2006: 151 n. 6. Nesselrath 2011: 191 identifies various forerunners of Pestalozzi and J. T. Kakridis in the nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries. The coining of the term 'neo-analysis': J. T. Kakridis 1949: 2.

¹³⁵ Severyns 1928: 98–9.

ἐτελείετο βουλή preserves a fine specimen of neoanalytical thinking *avant la lettre* when it comments that ‘others have said that Homer speaks from a certain myth’, and continues: ‘the myth is to be found in Stasinus, poet of the *Cypria*’. (The ‘neoanalytical’ position here is attributable to the so-called ‘Mythographus Homericus’; it is not shared by the author of the scholion himself, who sides with Aristarchus: Σ D *Il.* 1.5, lines 19–22 van Thiel.)¹³⁶ Herodotus, too, comes close to neoanalytical thinking when he uses an account allegedly related by Egyptian priests in the fifth century BC to reconstruct a tradition about Helene and the Trojan War which Homer knew, suppressed, and yet alluded to (2.116). Arguably, classical poets such as Apollonius, Virgil, and Quintus recognized and responded to Homer’s allusive transference of motifs, and in doing so could be said to be reading Homer ‘neoanalytically’.¹³⁷ On some interpretations, ‘Homer’ himself recognized allusive transferences in earlier poetry: the *Odyssey*-poet, in acknowledging the *Iliad*’s transference of motifs from Antilochos to Patroklos; and the *Iliad*-poet, in acknowledging the Babylonian *Gilgamesh* epic’s transference of motifs from Gilgamesh to Enkidu.¹³⁸ With such controversial suggestions, we approach the possibility that Homer both understood earlier poetry in what we may reasonably call a neoanalytical way, and himself composed to be understood that way.

The emphases of this book differ from some neoanalytical approaches. Thus, Homer’s ‘sources’ are of interest here for revealing a poetics of allusion, not for any insight into the genesis or composition of the Homeric poems.¹³⁹ Moreover, neoanalysis is here conceived as a matter fundamentally of poetics rather than mythology.¹⁴⁰ A further difference from traditional neoanalysis is the considerably expanded dataset of putative ‘source’ and ‘target’ texts treated. First, Cyclical epic, especially the *Aethiopis* and the *Little Iliad*, as (indirect) ‘sources’ of the *Iliad* (standard neoanalytical terrain).¹⁴¹ Second, the *Iliad*, as a ‘source’ of the *Odyssey*.¹⁴² Third, earlier lost poetry on Odysseus’

¹³⁶ On the ‘Mythographus Homericus’ (a specialized mythological commentary on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* of the imperial age), see Montanari 1995: 139–41, 145, 148, and esp. 162 on Σ D *Il.* 1.5; cf. Montanari 2002: *passim*.

¹³⁷ → Quintus, and Homeric motif transference; → Virgil, and Homeric motif transference.

¹³⁸ See § 2.3, p. 59, and Appendix C, p. 242, on Antilochos and Patroklos at ⇒ *Od.* 24.76–9. See § 5.19 pp. 216–17, on Gilgamesh–Enkidu and Achilles–Patroklos in the *Iliad*.

¹³⁹ Cf. Danek 2005a: 6; ‘Die Aithiopis als Modell und “Quelle der Ilias” hat nicht nur für jene Forscher Relevanz, die die Genese der Ilias rekonstruieren wollen, sondern auch für die Rezipienten, denen durch das Wissen um die vorausliegende Mythentradition eine zusätzliche Bedeutungsebene der Ilias erschlossen wird.’ Cf. Dowden 1996: 58 and nn. 61–2; Burgess 2006a: 177; 2009: 64–5, 71. Contrast Willcock 1987: 185; 1997: 175; cf. J. T. Kakridis 1949: 7.

¹⁴⁰ Edmunds 1997: 438: ‘This approach [sc. Neoanalysis] ... belongs to the poetics of Homeric epic and not to the study of Homeric myth.’

¹⁴¹ See §§ 2.3, 4.3–4.5. Esp. Kullmann 1960; Burgess 2001, 2009.

¹⁴² See § 2.1. Esp. Usener 1990 (seen in the context of neoanalysis: Kullmann 1991: 444–5 = 1992: 120–1; Doherty 2009: 8).

homecoming as a 'source' of the *Odyssey*.¹⁴³ Fourth, the 'Homeric' *Hymn to Aphrodite* as a 'source' (indirect) of the *Iliad*.¹⁴⁴ Fifth, an archaic Attic-'Orphic' Hymn to Demeter as a 'source' (indirect) of the 'Homeric' *Hymn to Demeter*.¹⁴⁵ And finally, Near Eastern poetry as a 'source' (indirect?) of various early Greek hexameter poetry.¹⁴⁶ This list, generous though it is, is not meant to circumscribe the early Greek hexameter material that may be responsive to neoanalytical methods.¹⁴⁷

As well as expanding the traditional synchronic perspective of neoanalysis, this book is fundamentally concerned to extend the diachronic perspective. The contention here is that our understanding of the allusive poetics found in Homer and other early Greek hexameter poets can usefully be informed by the allusive poetics found at other stages of this tradition, both later (Attic tragedy, Alexandrian and Augustan poetry) and earlier (Near Eastern mythological poetry of the third to second millennia BC). An underlying assumption is that Homer scholarship has something to learn from these other poetic traditions, and from the respective scholarship on these traditions. This, of course, is controversial; F. Budelmann and J. Haubold, for instance, warn that:

we must beware of judging Homeric epic by literary standards other than its own. In their search for a viable model, scholars of Homer have sometimes looked to the reception of Greek poetry on the part of Latin authors. But even the most superficial of glances suggests that the analogy is a false one: Latin poets partake in a poetics of allusion and imitation (*imitatio*, *aemulatio* etc.) of which the reception of Greek literary models is an integral part. These are important aspects of the early modern reception of classical literature too..., but with Homer the situation is very different.¹⁴⁸

But the situation may not be so different that precisely this comparison, among others, cannot be valid and illuminating.¹⁴⁹

There is a tendency to think of intertextuality or specific allusion as the preserve of post-classical Greek poetry: 'Alexandrian epic is "arte allusiva"...

¹⁴³ See § 2.2. Esp. Danek 1998a (for whose fundamentally neoanalytical orientation, cf. *ibid.* 24–5; Kullmann 2002: 173; Nesselrath 2011: 192).

¹⁴⁴ See §§ 5.3, 5.7. For a comparable, but different, argument, see M. L. West 2011c: 34–9; cf. M. L. West 2011a: 292, seeing *HHom* 1 as a *direct* source of the *Iliad*.

¹⁴⁵ See § 3.3. For analogous arguments for allusive relationships between *Hymns*, cf. N. J. Richardson 2010: 26 and 157 (*HHerm* and an earlier hypothetical 'Hymn to Hermes'); *ibid.* 20–1 (*HHerm* and *HAp*); O. Thomas 2011 (*HPan* and *HHerm*; cf. Janko 1982: 185).

¹⁴⁶ See Chapter 5 *passim* (related to neoanalysis: Kullmann 1991: 430–3 = 1992: 105–8).

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Currie 2012a: 573. Further, for [Euripides'] *Rhesus* as a 'source' for the Iliadic *Doloneia*, cf. Fenik 1964: esp. 7–16, 40, 54, 62–3 (a neoanalytical approach: Danek 1988: 12 n. 11). For the *Thebaid* as an indirect 'source' of the *Iliad*, see Torres-Guerra 1995; Mülher 1910: 57–77; Kullmann 1991: 426–7 = 1992: 102–3; 2002: 167–8; 2012a: 210; Singor 1992; Cingano 2005: 123 n. 23; M. L. West 2011a: 29 and n. 2.

¹⁴⁸ Budelmann and Haubold 2008: 22. Cf. Haubold 2013a: 24, 31; Kelly 2015a: 34.

¹⁴⁹ So, e.g., Pasquali 1951 (1942) (see § 1.2, p. 4); D. P. Fowler 1997: 31 = 2000: 134.

par excellence.¹⁵⁰ The supposedly new literary aesthetic accompanies a supposed shift from an oral performance culture to a literary book culture, and what we identify as characteristic of this period we exclude from earlier periods.¹⁵¹ There is good reason, here as elsewhere, to resist the attractions of grand literary-historical narratives and too-decisive watersheds.¹⁵² This particular watershed can be deconstructed in both directions. First, not all Hellenistic poetry engaged in specific allusion: alongside the avant-garde Alexandrian epic poetry of the Hellenistic period, with its self-conscious allusiveness, there appears to have existed, and in greater bulk, non-avant-garde epic that alluded to Homer in a generic, non-specifically allusive way.¹⁵³ Second, there is a case for seeing the allusive strategies of Alexandrian *epos* as consciously taken over from Homeric epic: in that case, the Alexandrians themselves recognized that such allusion was there from the start, and so too should we.¹⁵⁴ R. B. Rutherford has recently said: 'It used to be maintained that *arte allusiva* was a phenomenon of the Hellenistic era, but more recently "Alexandrian" allusiveness has been traced as far back as Euripides, even to Pindar; perhaps we shall find that Homer was the founding father here as in so much else.'¹⁵⁵ The founding father, I would only add, in extant Greek poetic tradition; it is important that "Alexandrian" allusiveness' can also be traced back to Mesopotamian poetry.

For J. M. Foley, 'traditional' was the most critical term in the definition 'traditional oral-derived epic'.¹⁵⁶ The word is acknowledged to be a slippery one.¹⁵⁷ In one sense, much as 'traditional society' is in implied opposition to 'industrial society', so 'traditional art' appears to be in an inevitable antithesis to 'literary art'. A 'traditional poet' in this sense is bound to be quite different

¹⁵⁰ Giangrande 1967: 85. Cf. Gutzwiller 2007: 169; Acosta-Hughes 2011: 4–6.

¹⁵¹ Burgess 2001: 117 (but see Burgess 2012a: 169); S. R. West 2012b: 532–3.

¹⁵² D. P. Fowler 1997: 31 = 2000: 134; Pfeijffer 1999: 60; cf. D. L. Cairns 2010: 55; A. D. Morrison 2007a: 40–1; Acosta-Hughes 2010; cf. Irwin 2005: 100–1 and n. 35; Wright 2012: 169; cf. 141–4; Carey 2015: 61.

¹⁵³ Bing 1988: 54–6, 72–3, esp. 55: 'a reader comes away with the overwhelming impression that this author [sc. of *SH* 946–7] employs epicism in a "non-allusive" way—that is, his vocabulary is generally not intended to recall particular characters, descriptions or turns of phrase in specific scenes of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*'.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Bing 1988: 73: 'though such a technique was nothing new, the authors of this time pushed it further than ever before and assigned to it a position of unexampled pre-eminence'. Bakker 2013: 159 sharply distinguishes between Virgilian or Apollonian 'allusion' and Homeric 'interformularity'.

¹⁵⁵ R. B. Rutherford 2013: 81. Cf. Lohmann 1970: 187, 209, 284. Differently, Kelly 2015a, arguing that an '*arte allusiva*' is not to be found in Greek poetry before Stesichorus. However, our meagre record of seventh-century lyric cannot sustain the argument from silence; the seventh- to sixth-century hexametric evidence (*Odyssey*, the Hesiodic poems, the *Hymns*) is more pertinent.

¹⁵⁶ e.g. J. M. Foley 1997a: 166. On the importance of 'traditional', cf. Russo 1992: 18; Lord 1995: 1; Scodel 2002: 3.

¹⁵⁷ J. M. Foley 1997a: 166 n. 49; Cantilena 2013. Cf. Čolaković 2006: 183.

from, say, Virgil. Yet Euripides and Sophocles, Apollonius and Theocritus, Virgil and Ovid are all in their way 'traditional' poets, and their 'traditionality' can be related, perhaps profitably, to Homer's.¹⁵⁸ This book is interested in Homer's relation to what is often, though not wholly satisfactorily, called 'the classical tradition'.¹⁵⁹ The 'tradition' intended here consists of a sequence of texts, spanning several language 'barriers', that not only engage in *imitatio* of their predecessors, but whose *imitatio* sometimes extends strikingly to imitation of their predecessors' *imitatio*.¹⁶⁰ An assumption of this book is that we may understand Homer's allusive art better by reading both up and down that tradition.

One arresting way in which the continuity of this tradition is manifested is the arguable appearance in early Greek hexameter poetry of self-reflexive 'tropes' of allusion, many of which can also be seen in other literature, especially Latin poetry and, arguably, even in Mesopotamian literature.¹⁶¹ The following may serve as an illustrative list. First, signals to the source-text.¹⁶² Second, words of iteration, indicating a sequel or a prequel.¹⁶³ Third, a character's 'recalling' when something happened, cueing the audience's recollection of an episode in another poem: poetic memory.¹⁶⁴ Fourth, references to fate and prophecy or to a god's (especially Zeus' or Athene's) will as figures for the poetic tradition or alternatively for the poet's own considered departures from it.¹⁶⁵ Fifth, *nekyiai* as a means of engaging the poetry of the past.¹⁶⁶ Sixth,

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Sale 1996*b* (see § 1.2, pp. 8–9); Dowden 1996: 49 n. 14: 'Virgil is rather an oral poet in his closeness to tradition'; Austin 1975: 17: 'any poet within a particular linguistic and poetic tradition is traditional'.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. 'the Classical Tradition' in titles of works such as Kallendorf 2007; Grafton, Most, and Settis 2010; Silk, Gildenhard, and Barrow 2014. Not wholly satisfactorily, among other reasons, if the 'classical' tradition turns out to have its roots in Sumerian and Akkadian poetry (Currie 2012*a*: 554 and n. 66).

¹⁶⁰ Burrow 1997: 90: 'One way, and perhaps the most powerful way, of imitating a predecessor is to imitate his methods of imitation, and to treat his text as he had treated his own sources.'

¹⁶¹ 'Tropes': Hinds 1998: esp. 2–16; Barchiesi 2001 (1995): 130. In Latin poetry: e.g. Conte 1986: 23–4. In Mesopotamian poetry: see § 5.19.

¹⁶² e.g. ⇒ *Od.* 12.70 Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα. Danek 1998*a*: 23–4, 506–7; cf. Mulder 1910: 39–44, 61 and n. 1. In tragedy: Eur. *Phoen.* 854–5 (Mastronarde 1994: 399). In Latin poetry: e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 8.382–4, 10.469–70 (Knauer 1964: 299; Barchiesi 1984: 18–19 = 2015: 7), 11.648, 662 (Fraenkel 1932: 24); Lyne 1987: 'Index' s.v. "Signals" to other texts'.

¹⁶³ e.g. ⇒ *Il.* 16.446 καὶ ἄλλος. Cf. *Epigoni*, fr. 1 Bernabé νῦν αὖθ'. For αὖτε signalling a sequel, cf. Stes. fr. 193 *PMGF* δεῦρ' αὖτε (Feeney 1991: 15) and δηδῶτε in other lyric poetry (Hutchinson 2001: 155, 275). In Euripides: Torrance 2013: 8, 194–5, 219–33, 292–4, on δεύτερος, δισσός, καινός. ⇒ Theocr. 1.112. In Latin poetry: Hardie 1993: 17 and n. 34; Hinds 1998: 114 and n. 26.

¹⁶⁴ e.g. ⇒ *Il.* 20.188 ἧ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε...; See § 4.9. In Latin poetry: Conte 1986; Hinds 1998: 3–4, 115.

¹⁶⁵ e.g. ⇒ *Il.* 16.433 μοῖρ'. Nagy 1979: 40 and § 17 n. 2; De Jong 1987: 263 n. 76; S. Richardson 1990: 194; Janko 1992: 6, 371; J. V. Morrison 1997: 284; Scodel 1999: 140; 2002: 68; Marks 2008: 6; Tsagalis 2011: 226. In Latin: Barchiesi 2001 (1995): 131–2, 133–5.

¹⁶⁶ Most 1992; Kullmann 2002: 154 = 1995: 50–1. In Attic drama: Aristophanes' *Frogs*. In Hellenistic poetry: Bing 1988: 71–2 (Timon of Phlius); Kerkhecker 1999: 11–17; Ps.-Moschus

metapoetic metaphors of 'borrowing',¹⁶⁷ 'theft',¹⁶⁸ 'filiation',¹⁶⁹ and 'sibling relationships'.¹⁷⁰ And, finally, the song within a song.¹⁷¹

Two other notable features of allusion in early Greek hexameter poetry, though not self-reflexive tropes of allusion, deserve mention here, as both are importantly paralleled earlier and later in the tradition. The first is opposition in imitation or contrast-imitation: the tendency for a target-text to work detailed and systematic reversals on its source-text.¹⁷² It is noteworthy that the same tendency to detailed and systematic reversals is found with paired speeches in the *Iliad*: the way that two poems may be in intertextual 'dialogue' with one another is thus akin to the way in which characters may be in dialogue with one another within a single poem.¹⁷³ The second feature is narrative inconsistency: the capacity for a narrative to be pulled simultaneously in two or more incompatible directions.¹⁷⁴ This has long played an important role in Homeric scholarship for analysts, neoanalysts, and oralists alike.¹⁷⁵ This phenomenon in particular seems capable of being illuminated by

Epitaphius Bionis 115–19. In Latin poetry (and beyond: Dante, Milton, etc.): Hardie 1993: 101–5; 1998: 53 n. 1; 2014: 21–49; Hor. *Carm.* 2.13.21–40.

¹⁶⁷ Patroklos borrows Achilles' arms in *Iliad* XVI when acting out a narrative role traditionally associated with the latter (§ 2.3, p. 60; Appendix C, p. 242); and Hera likewise borrows Aphrodite's girdle in the *Dios apate* (§ 5.3, p. 152).

¹⁶⁸ Hermes stealing from Apollo in *HHerm* tropes *HHerm*'s allusive relationship to *HAp*: N. J. Richardson 2007: 90; O. Thomas (forthcoming).

¹⁶⁹ Pan son of Hermes tropes the filiation of *HPan* from *HHerm*: O. Thomas 2011: 168; cf. Janko 1982: 185. 'Fathers-sons' succession tropes the filiation of *Epigoni* from *Thebaid*: Burkert 2002: 34; Cingano 2015: 244, 254–5. Neoptolemos son of Achilles tropes the filiation of Sophocles' *Philoctetes* from the *Iliad*: Hunter 2004: 237; cf. Schein 2013: 15. Filiation in Latin epic: cf. Hardie 1993: 88–119.

¹⁷⁰ The competitive sibling relationship between Hermes and Apollo in *HHerm* tropes the poem's competitive-parodic relationship to *HAp*: O. Thomas 2011: 168. Similarly, with the sibling relationship of Ereshkigal and Ishtar and the intertextual relationship of the Standard Babylonian poems *Nergal and Ereshkigal* and *Ishtar's Descent* (see § 5.14, p. 192). Similarly, again, with the respective eponymous sibling hero(in)es of Henry Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* and Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*, troping the former's competitive-parodic relationship with the latter.

¹⁷¹ Rinon 2006 (Demodokos' songs in *Odyssey* VIII); O. Thomas 2011: 159–68 (*HPan*). Cf. Hunter 1993a: 148–51 (on Orpheus' songs in A.R.). In Latin poetry: Hardie 1986: 52–66 (on Iopas' song at Virg. *Aen.* 1.740–7); D. P. Fowler 2000b.

¹⁷² Kuiper 1896: 114; Giangrande 1967; Conte 1986: 36; R. F. Thomas 1986: 185–9; Farrell 1991: 13 and n. 18; Gale 2007: 11–12 n. 34; Hardie 2007: 117. In Sappho's allusions to Homer: Rissman 1983: 13–19. In Bacchylides' allusions to Homer (esp. ⇒ Bacch. 13.121–40): Currie 2010: 223 and n. 50.

¹⁷³ Reversals in paired speeches in the *Iliad*: Lohmann 1970: 112–30. In general, for 'Umkehr in der Wiederkehr des Gleichen' ('reversal in recurrence of the same [motif]'), see Lohmann 1988: 64. This is the intratextual phenomenon whose intertextual counterpart is opposition in imitation. In general on *Umkehr* ('reversal') in the Homeric poems, see Lohmann 1970: 185; Reinhardt 1961: 15, 413 n. 1, 466–9; and, in the Homeric treatment of mythical material, Kullmann 2005: 22.

¹⁷⁴ R. B. Rutherford 2013: 94: 'the poet is consistently following one version while playing on his audience's awareness of another'.

¹⁷⁵ See § 1.2, p. 22 and n. 133.

diachronic and comparative perspectives.¹⁷⁶ There is an increasing readiness now to consider this a sophisticated technique of allusion, not only in early Greek epic, Greek tragedy, and Latin poetry, but also in South Slavic epic: a nice congruence, in that case, of supposedly 'oral-traditional' and supposedly 'literary' techniques.¹⁷⁷

The finding, if accepted, of explicitly intertextual features in early Greek hexameter poetry has interesting consequences. For one thing, it suggests the possible historical continuity of a poetics of allusion from Mesopotamia via Greece to Rome, or the presence, at least, of a closely comparable poetics of allusion in all of Mesopotamia, Greece, and Rome.¹⁷⁸ Either way, an allusive art in early Greek epic would become a decidedly less solitary phenomenon. For another, it suggests that the early Greek hexameter poets did not only self-consciously transform their sources, but encouraged their audiences (or 'ideal listeners': § 1.6) to recognize how those sources were being transformed. In other words, that early Greek epic poets could take a self-conscious attitude to their tradition, and that not all was governed by a 'rhetoric of traditionality'.¹⁷⁹

Certainly, the Homeric epics should not be credited lightly with such developed 'literary' techniques at a time when writing and literature were still in their infancy, even if these poems are granted to be 'transitional' texts, exhibiting both oral and written properties. At the same time, however, we must remember that the difficulties are exacerbated, and perhaps created, by factors about which we are in the dark. Was writing in its infancy when the Homeric epics were composed? (On one view, there had been approximately a century of experimentation with literacy before the epics were committed to writing.)¹⁸⁰ Must the techniques in question be distinctively literary ones? What was the impact (if any) of Near Eastern literature? It is possible that Mesopotamian poetry enjoyed for a long time a scribal tradition in parallel with an oral performance tradition and that there was ongoing reciprocal

¹⁷⁶ O'Hara 2007: 1.

¹⁷⁷ In early Greek epic: Burgess 2006: 170: 'What neoanalysts have considered mistakes discernible only by the critic are better seen as important signposts recognizable by the audience'; O'Hara 2007: 13–14 '[the idea of the poet alluding to variant versions of a myth] may sound like the claims of the Neo-analysts ... except that it involves not clues that the poet has accidentally left, but instead deliberate allusion to an alternate version'. In tragedy (Euripides' *Medea*): Dunn 1996: 94–5; cf. Michelini 1989: 122, 124, 129–30; Mastronarde 2002: 50–1, 383; differently, Mossman 2011: 7–8. In Latin poetry: O'Hara 2007. In Bosnian heroic song: Danek 1998a: 9–12.

¹⁷⁸ See § 5.19.

¹⁷⁹ See esp. Danek 1998a: 8, 80, 86, 526 'Index' s.v. 'Neuerungen unserer Odyssee'; Danek 1998b: 84 with n. 8, 91; 2002c: 17; 2010b: 126–7, 129, 135. The contrary view is more common: Scodel 2002: 33: 'Homeric poetry is strongly traditionalist, never acknowledging that any aspect of its story is not old.' The term 'rhetoric of traditionality' is employed by Scodel, *ibid.*, 92 and *passim*. Cf. Ford 1992: 69: 'we do not hear any anxiety about making an original contribution in Homer or Hesiod'; Andersen 2012: 147: 'the poets themselves need not be aware of their own innovations'.

¹⁸⁰ So Rösler 2011: 208.

influence between the two.¹⁸¹ If such self-reflexive tropes of allusion developed in the highly literary context of the Mesopotamian scribal tradition, it would not be surprising if they passed thence into the parallel performance tradition, and, if so, they could then have existed for centuries in an oral poetic tradition that by the eighth–seventh centuries BC had, arguably, influenced the Greek epic tradition profoundly.¹⁸² To be clear: writing plays a role in these ruminations not because it is supposed that there was a significant readership for any of the poems in question, but simply because writing has the capacity to alter the workings of a performance tradition.¹⁸³ The foregoing, of course, amounts to several stabs in the dark. But we *are* in the dark; and, as it is right that the darkness should not tell for the argument, so it is right that it should not tell against it either: if our texts give us sufficient warrant for recognizing such self-reflexive tropes in early Greek *epos*, then we should allow them to do so.

1.6 Audiences, Reconstructed ‘Sources’, Circularity

It was stated that Homer’s ‘sources’ are of interest here not for any insight they may offer into the genesis of the Homeric poems, but into the way the poems construct meaning; and, in the first instance, that meaning was constructed for an audience.¹⁸⁴ This raises the question how much an ancient audience can have known.¹⁸⁵ The problems here are, again, real, but not insurmountable. It must be recognized that an audience’s composition was inevitably mixed (including, at the top end of the competence scale, other singers) and its response must have been correspondingly complex.¹⁸⁶ The poems, moreover, are of a kind such as to succeed with variegated audiences: if a listener’s appreciation was enhanced by knowing more, it was not impaired, or not

¹⁸¹ M. L. West 1997: 599–600; George 2003: i.56; Henkelman 2006: 825; Patzek 2011: 394–5.

¹⁸² See Chapter 5; differently, Metcalf 2015.

¹⁸³ Cf. Čolaković 2006: 177–9.

¹⁸⁴ Epic poetry as performed to a large public (*δημος, λαός*): *Od.* 9.6; cf. 17.383; Heracl. fr. 104 D-K; cf. Sim. fr. 564.4 *PMG*. Taplin 1992: 42; cf. Nagy 1990*b* (1982): 38; 1996: 104; M. L. West 1998: 98.

¹⁸⁵ Danek 2005c: 280, after Z. Čolaković, on Bosnian heroic song: ‘der Sänger [kann] bei seinem Publikum die genaue Kenntnis der nur in Anspielungen zitierten Lieder voraussetzen Dies kann man allerdings nur erkennen, wenn man möglichst das komplette Repertoire eines Sängers studiert oder sämtliche Lieder innerhalb einer engeren Region, also den für das Publikum relevanten Rezeptionshorizont. Man wird dann feststellen, dass man einer mündlichen Tradition—sowohl den Sängern als auch dem Publikum—mehr an Wissen, Vernetzung und Komplexität zutrauen kann, als es viele Homer-Forscher einzugestehen gewillt sind.’ Differently, Andersen 1990: 37 and n. 21, 43–4 n. 30; Scodel 1997: 202; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 7.

¹⁸⁶ Taplin 1992: 10–11; Di Benedetto 2001: 7; Danek 2002*b*: 3; Nordheider 2012: 183–4. On audiences of Attic drama: Revermann 2006: 115: ‘The double-act of appealing to all while sustaining an individual’s interest by means of activating and challenging the personal level of competence lies at the heart of successfully competing at the dramatic festivals.’ Cf. Scodel 2002: 6, 8.

fatally, by their knowing less.¹⁸⁷ Secondly, we should guard against the ‘fallacy of audience limitation’.¹⁸⁸ The level of complexity or sophistication that a critic is justified in finding in a work should not be fixed at the lowest common denominator, the level of the least sophisticated auditor.¹⁸⁹ A more reasonable benchmark is a notional ‘ideal listener’.¹⁹⁰ The fallacy of audience limitation also concerns scepticism as to how an audience could detect allusions between poems experienced only in performance. The problems here, though not negligible, are not necessarily greater than with fifth-century tragedy and comedy, where intertextuality was likewise, for most theatregoers, a relationship between plays known through performance, not texts.¹⁹¹ Modern audiences, too, appreciate intertextual relationships in music and in film without seeing a score or script, and typically without the benefit of repeated listenings or viewings.¹⁹² The subsequent chapters of this book will make regular reference to audiences; in some cases, conceivable conditions of performance may make the prospects of audience perception of allusion relatively good (as with hymns to Demeter putatively performed and reperformed in the context of mystery cults in Attica: see § 3.8, p. 104); in other cases, the prospects of audience perception of allusion may seem relatively poor (as with Near Eastern and Greek epic poetry: see § 5.19). But the prospects of an audience perceiving an allusion are not identical with the question of whether an allusion is ‘there’. We should remember, besides, that the appreciation of allusion, like that of many of the finer features of Homeric poetry (as of fifth- and fourth-century tragedy and comedy) is likely to have been largely the province of the connoisseur—and is not the less interesting to us for that.¹⁹³

There is the further question of how we, now, can hope to reconstruct the poems once known to our ‘ideal listener’. The answer, again, is complex. The first thing to say is that not all of that ideal listener’s repertoire is lost. In a couple of cases, we have both putative ‘source-text’ and putative ‘target-text’

¹⁸⁷ Scodel 2002: 130 ‘Although there are advantages to knowing more, the knowledge is not essential’; *ibid.* 155; 2004: 48; Revermann 2006: 101: ‘layered inclusion’.

¹⁸⁸ Lyne 1994: 196–8 = 2007: 178–80.

¹⁸⁹ Wright 2012: 5; cf. Revermann 2006: 104.

¹⁹⁰ Danek 2002b: 4, 19: ‘ideally competent audience’. Cf. de Jong 1987: 95–6: ‘This presupposed knowledge of the NeFe₁ [primary narratee-focalizee] about characters and events is unusual... and is to be considered “historical” knowledge, acquired through hearing traditional stories or songs. Just as the NF₁ [primary narrator-focalizer] has been given the shape of a professional singer, his addressee is given the shape of a regular recipient of traditional songs... We may ask whether the NeFe₁ really always has the knowledge the NF₁ presupposes him to have.’

¹⁹¹ Di Benedetto 1994: 104; cf. Easterling 1997: 168–9. Wright 2012: 146–7 argues for ‘a “target” audience of bibliophiles’ for the fifth-century comic poets. Compare and contrast Hunter 2009: 24–5.

¹⁹² Cf. D. P. Fowler 1997: 29 = 2000: 132; Danek 2010a: 229.

¹⁹³ Tragedy: Lyne 1994: 197–8 = 2007: 179–80. Comedy: Wright 2012: 57.

preserved in their entirety; so with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (the first test case of Chapter 2). In other cases, we have putative indirect 'source-texts' in a complete or nearly complete state of preservation: this goes for the *Hymn to Aphrodite* and for Sumerian and Akkadian mythological poetry (arguably, indirect 'sources' of the *Iliad*: see Chapter 5). Such indirect 'sources' may offer us a decent approximation to the poems that actually figured in our ideal listener's repertoire. Only patchily attested, by contrast, is the putative indirect 'source' of the *Hymn to Demeter* (discussed in Chapter 3); and wholly unattested is any source of Penelope's recognition of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* (the second test case of Chapter 2). When the source-text is non-extant, it is solely features of the extant text that can suggest an allusion, and these may in some circumstances encourage the tentative reconstruction of a putative narrative alluded to. Narrative logic is often a key concept here; essentially we are engaged in the (always tentative) reconstruction of a 'simple story'.¹⁹⁴ A 'simple story', in U. Hölscher's definition, 'is identifiable in that it has its own narrative logic, motifs with fixed narrative consequences'.¹⁹⁵ In contrast to the 'simple story', the narrative of a 'secondary' or allusive text will typically show "“blind” motives (redundant in the new story, but relevant in the original)".¹⁹⁶ In some cases, it may appear that an original narrative logic has been overwritten by another in the text; then the putative lost narrative may be said still to be present, in some sense, within the extant narrative. This is described in Chapters 2 and 3 as a tension between 'surface' and 'deep' levels of narrative, and seen as a technique of allusion, a way in which an untraditional narrative simultaneously calls attention to and sets itself apart from a traditional narrative that is known to its (ideal) audience.

It is, of course, a problematic procedure to attempt to reconstruct an 'original tale logic'.¹⁹⁷ Not only is there scope to dispute what is and is not 'logical', it is also far from undisputed that a 'less logical' narrative must presuppose or be consequent on a 'more logical' one. Nor need a reconstructed 'original tale logic' equate to any historical pre-existing poetic narrative.¹⁹⁸ It may be noted that the difficulty of identifying a 'simple story' with a given lost poetic treatment is not confined to early Greek epic. Euripides' *Hippolytus*, for instance, appears to interact with a 'simple story' of the 'Potiphar's wife' type,

¹⁹⁴ Hölscher 1988: 25–34; 1978: 52; cf. Renger 2006: 147. For illustrations of the method of reconstructing a 'simple story', see Danek 2002c, reconstructing the 'simple story' behind the Skylla and Charybdis narrative in *Odyssey* XII; Hölscher 1988: 28, reconstructing the 'simple story' behind the Meleagros narrative in *Iliad* IX (cf. J. T. Kakridis 1949: 13–16).

¹⁹⁵ Hölscher 1988: 26 (translated). Cf. Danek 1998a: 482: 'einen Ablauf, in dem die Motive im Gegensatz zu unserer Version ihre "natürliche" Funktion erfüllen', 'einen Handlungsablauf, der in sich konsequenter und logischer erscheint als die verschlungenen Wege, die die Handlung unserer Odyssee nimmt'.

¹⁹⁶ Quotation from Henkelman 2006: 815.

¹⁹⁷ Csapo 2005: 57–67 (on Odysseus and the Cyclops).

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Hölscher 1988: 28.

but it is unclear whether that 'simple story' should be identified with Euripides' lost play, *Hippolytus Veiled*.¹⁹⁹ There is a danger of reifying the version alluded to when it was purely virtual.²⁰⁰ But when a given subject is known to have been treated repeatedly and variously in early Greek hexameter poetry before a given poem (as is the case with Odysseus' Homecoming and the *Odyssey*, and the Rape of Persephone and the *Hymn to Demeter*), then there is at least a fair chance that the 'simple story' presupposed and alluded to is also a poetic treatment, and known to the (ideal) audience: why, when so many real poetic versions were circulating, should poets engage only with notional alternative possibilities (see Chapters 2 and 3)?

Such arguments, where a putative 'source' is thus reconstructed in whole or in part, are vulnerable to the charge of circularity. J. S. Burgess has commented on 'the circular logic that is often present in the thought of neo-analysts', noting that '[t]o reconstruct a pre-Homeric story on the basis of the *Iliad* and then to claim that the reconstructed story influenced the *Iliad* is not sound methodology'.²⁰¹ In fact, the suspicion of circularity attaches equally to the reconstruction of a pre-Homeric story on the basis of the Epic Cycle as to a reconstruction on the basis solely of the *Iliad* itself: it is possible that the Cyclical Epics, rather than testifying to a tradition independent of Homer, are responding to the *Iliad* (the assumption of Aristarchus, and others). But the charge of circularity should not be brought too quickly. Many scholarly undertakings are, virtuously, circular.²⁰² To take a later text (say an epic of the Cycle or Quintus of Smyrna's *Posthomerica*) as providing evidence for an episode to which Homer was alluding, when in fact the later text was composed purposely to supply a scene to which the *Iliad* could appear to be alluding, would indeed be circular argumentation (see § 4.4). But the procedure in question is not inherently circular: it is, simply, that of advancing a hypothesis to explain data, features of the early Greek hexameter texts before us. The examination of the data leads to the formulation of a hypothesis which explains the data. There is an ABA structure here, but no 'circularity'; the procedure does not take the form of an argument where the premise presupposes the conclusion and vice versa. In fact, we are not dealing with an argument with premise and conclusion at all, but—always—with a hypothesis: that there was a (now lost) poem X such that an extant poem Y is interacting

¹⁹⁹ Gibert 1997: 96–7; Hutchinson 2004: 23.

²⁰⁰ Danek 1998a: 25: 'die Frage, ob nicht der Dichter sich sein "außertextliches" Bezugsmaterial jeweils selbst kreiert, also das Zitat gleichsam nur fingiert'. Cf. Andersen 1990: 37: 'There is little allusion in Homer; often there is nothing "behind" a reference in terms of tradition'; Willcock 1977: 53: 'It is far too easy to leap to conclusions, and assume debts to hypothetical models'; Lohmann 1970: 198–200, 202.

²⁰¹ Burgess 1997: 6 ~ 2009: 73; cf. *ibid.* 29.

²⁰² See e.g. Taplin 1992: 4–5; Volk 2002: 26.

with features of poem X. We may be troubled by any, explicit or implicit, promotion of that hypothesis to the status of *fact*: ‘*therefore* there was a poem X with which poem Y interacted’. But there is nothing procedurally incorrect in either formulating the hypothesis or testing it against the data that it was meant to explain, and perhaps, ideally, finding that it succeeds in explaining more textual data that it was initially developed to explain. Depending on its explanatory power, it may be judged attractive or not.²⁰³ If we feel seduced by the hypothesis, we may indeed start to think it true. But there can never be any question of thus *proving* that lost poems with given contents existed, or that extant poems interacted with them in given ways.²⁰⁴ One might be troubled by a procedure that relies on an unprovable hypothesis; but by the same token there must be a lot in the humanities (and in the world generally) that can be found troubling.²⁰⁵ I have found the hypotheses advanced in this book sufficiently attractive to be worth disseminating.

1.7 Method and Terminology

Much has already been implied about the book’s method and its preferred terminology, which this section aims to make explicit. The detection of allusion is neither an exact science nor is it hopelessly arbitrary.²⁰⁶ In practice, there is fairly widespread agreement about what criteria claimed allusions should meet: above all, that they should be marked and meaningful.²⁰⁷ The condition of markedness will be met when allusion is claimed between passages which share striking and distinctive non-typical elements, or typical elements that are deployed in contextually striking and distinctive ways.²⁰⁸ Markedness limits the possibility that the connection between two (or more) contexts is due just to coincidence or to typology. The meaningfulness

²⁰³ Fenik 1964: 42–3 (on the adaptation of a Rhesos story in the *Doloneia*): ‘The assumption of a “source” ... is no cure-all or automatic solution. It must either remain pure hypothesis, or justify itself by its capacity to solve specific problems in the text.’ We should rather say: it will always remain a hypothesis, but may become an attractive one if it does so justify itself, an idle one if it does not.

²⁰⁴ Blush 1970: 88–9 (critiquing Heitsch 1963): ‘dieses Verfahren bleibt hypothetisch’, ‘von einem ausgesprochenen Beweisverfahren kann hier wirklich nicht die Rede sein’; cf. Blümer 2001: i.11: ‘Zirkelschluß.’

²⁰⁵ On one influential philosophical view, ‘scientific theories are empirical hypotheses and remain so, however successful they are at withstanding repeated attempts to falsify them’: Belsey 1995.

²⁰⁶ Not a science: Garner 1990: 1.

²⁰⁷ E.g., D. P. Fowler 1997: 15, 20 = 2000: 118, 122–3; cf. R. F. Thomas 1986: 174; Pucci 1987: 238; Korenjak 1998: 143.

²⁰⁸ The latter corresponds roughly to the higher end of the ‘scale of interformularity’ of Bakker 2013: 157–69.

requirement guarantees that a claimed allusion should increase our understanding of a passage or help it to make sense in a larger interpretative framework. The demonstration of pointed or systematic reversals of the putative source-text by the putative target-text (where both are extant) can aid the argument for a meaningfully allusive relationship between the two ($\rightarrow$ opposition in imitation).²⁰⁹ Even in cases where the putative source-text is non-extant, the meaningfulness condition is capable of being addressed if a claimed allusion would fill a perceived $\rightarrow$ interpretative gap in the putative target-text. That 'interpretative gap' may lie in seemingly defective narrative logic in the putative target-text ($\rightarrow$ narrative inconsistency). Or it may lie in deficient actorial motivation, if characters do something that seems insufficiently motivated by the immediate narrative (for instance, shedding $\rightarrow$ 'pregnant' tears). Or, again, it may lie in the perceived inconsequentiality of an action or its unsuitability to its agent, engendering a feeling that the action 'ought' to have had different (and usually greater) consequences, or that it 'ought' more 'properly' to have been performed by another character or in another situation. This brings us to the phenomenon of $\rightarrow$ motif transference: the recognition that some narrative feature 'belongs' not *here*, but *there* (or rather, 'belongs' more 'properly' there than here), prompting us to compare *this* context with *that* context. Many of the foregoing features (motif transference, narrative inconsistency, plot inconsequentiality) were not originally viewed as aspects of allusion in older neoanalytical scholarship, but it often makes sense to view them as such.²¹⁰

The terminology of allusion is multifarious and differently deployed by different writers. The variety of terms available may be useful in capturing the various aspects of this avowedly unscientific enterprise, provided that they are used clearly and consistently. I have in general preferred *allusion* over *intertextuality*. 'Allusion' carries the implication of an 'intention-bearing author', but that implication need not be objectionable and has its own virtues.²¹¹ The use of 'intertextuality' is well established in Homeric scholarship to convey bidirectional influence between 'performance traditions' (not poems), an application for which the term is well suited. That makes it, however, less suited to the present study (see § 1.4). Nevertheless, I use the pairing *intertextual(ity)* and *intratextual(ity)* as a convenient way of referring to, respectively, allusion between different poems and allusion within a single poem.

²⁰⁹ For the terms 'source-text' and 'target-text' (and alternatives), see Edmunds 2001: 137–9. In our context, the 'source-text' could be an entity of various sorts: an extant poem, a lost poem, a 'song-tradition', a mythological tradition, a 'simple story', etc. (see § 1.4, p. 12).

²¹⁰ $\rightarrow$ Neoanalysis and allusion.

²¹¹ See esp. Hinds 1998: 47–51 (critiqued: Edmunds 2001: 164–7) and M. Heath 2002: 59–97, esp. 63–5 (critiquing Lyne 1994: 199–200 = 2007: 181–2). For a desire to 'sidestep' the implication of the intention-bearing author, cf. Burgess 2006: 171 ~ 2009: 66–7; cf. Nagy 1996a: 21.

Interaction is a usefully vague term. A poem can interact with various entities: the poetic tradition, the mythological tradition, a 'simple story', another poem. When interaction is with another poem, it may take various forms. The strongest of these is *quotation*.²¹² My use of this term envisages a particularly strongly marked relationship between two entities, where we are almost obliged to see the connection. The relationship can exist on the macro- or the micro-level; we may accordingly recognize a spectrum from *non-verbatim* to *verbatim quotation*.²¹³ Moving down that spectrum, from macro- to micro-, we may find quotation on the level of song-type, narrative sequence, motif, or wording.²¹⁴ Under *evocation* I envisage a less strongly marked relationship than quotation: here we may feel more invited than compelled to see the connection, may be put more vaguely in mind of the source-text. If my use of 'quotation' and 'evocation' has more to do with the degrees of markedness involved, then *allusion* relates more to meaningfulness: I choose 'x alludes to y' (rather than 'quotes' or 'evokes') when features in a target-text (e.g. interpretative gap, narrative inconsistency, etc.) invite us to interpret it in the light of a source-text. *Connotation* conveys a similar notion to allusion, but coupled with its companion term *denotation* usefully draws attention to the simultaneous presence of two levels of signification.²¹⁵ The distinction between connotation and allusion can also be exploited: in my usage, 'x alludes to y' implies that y is a real entity (e.g. a real poem, though not necessarily extant), while 'x connotes y' allows for the possibility that y is not real, but simply the idea of a particular narrative, scene, etc., conjured up by x. To say that 'x engages in the reception of y' or 'x is a refiguration of y' puts the emphasis on the changes (meaningfully) worked on text y by text x; 'reception' is a neutral term; 'refiguration' implies more radical and significant changes. Another clutch of terms serves to indicate that a recurrence is not due to typology: thus 'x reprises (or: is a specific reprise of) y' conveys that a later recurrence has been cued by a specific earlier occurrence; 'x depends on y' envisages a similar situation, but allows that the connection between x and y may be mediated and suits a situation where x may be in a chain of reception

²¹² My usage of the term is more restricted than that of Edmunds 2001: 134, who adopts it as 'a general, inclusive way of describing [intertextuality]'.
²¹³ Edmunds 2001: 134: 'To quote means to repeat part of another text in such a way (which would sometimes entail sufficient quantity) that its status as a quotation and its source may be discernible. Quotation, of whatever length, may be either exact or inexact. At one extreme, the same word or words are repeated in the same case in the same metrical position. At the other extreme, scholars have discussed quotation through content, context, syntax, and also sound (i.e., even without the repetition of any of the *same* words from one poem to another).' The 'slippage' objected to by Allan 2008: 212 n. 37 in this usage of 'quotation' is part of the point.

²¹⁴ For all these as various types of 'quoting' (*zitieren*), see e.g. Danek 1998a: *passim*; 2002a: 319 n. 405; 2002b.
²¹⁵ 'Denotation' versus 'connotation' in allusion: Conte 1986: 38–9, 55.

leading ultimately back to y . In the first instance, both 'reprises' and 'depends on' can express a purely genetic claim (x owes its being specifically to y , rather than being typologically generated), but arguments for allusion may follow on from that genetic claim.²¹⁶

These terms may seem proliferating and imprecise; my hope is that they are neither more nor less imprecise than they need to be to discharge their less-than-scientific function. The primary concern throughout, however, is with the recognition and explication of allusive phenomena in the texts, rather than their labelling; it should be possible for the reader, if dissatisfied with any or all of them, to substitute the terms of his or her preference without serious detraction from the argument.

1.8 Organization of the Book

The four chapters which follow are independent of, though in close dialogue with, each other. Chapter 2 surveys three central and well-known arguments for allusion in early Greek epic: that the *Odyssey* alludes to the *Iliad*, that the *Odyssey* alludes to hypothesized earlier epic poetry on the Homecoming of Odysseus, and that the *Iliad* alludes to a hypothetical precursor of the fragmentarily preserved *Aethiopis*. Recurring issues in this chapter are whether to infer allusive or typological relationships between the compositions discussed, and whether to assume allusive relationships between specific poems or between 'song-traditions' or 'simple stories'. A case is made in this chapter for quotation, both non-verbatim and verbatim; for narrative inconsistency as a Homeric technique of allusion; and for Homer's use of various tropes of allusion, especially fate as a metapoetic metaphor and the signalling of the source-text. Another key issue of the chapter is the comparability of Homeric and Virgilian allusion.

Chapter 3 overlaps closely in methodology with Chapter 2, dealing likewise with narrative inconsistency, tropes of allusion, the problem of fixity of text, and the status of what gets quoted (a poem? a song-tradition?). But this chapter, unlike its predecessor, addresses a test case that falls outside the mainstream of neoanalysis: the possibility that the 'Homeric' *Hymn to Demeter* alludes to (lost) hexameter poetry on the Rape of Persephone. This investigation is methodologically parallel to that into the relationship of the *Iliad* and the hypothetical precursor of the *Aethiopis*: in both cases we are dealing with, on the one hand, a fully preserved 'Homeric' poem (the *Iliad*, *HDem*) and, on the other, a fragmentarily preserved non-Homeric poem (the

²¹⁶ For specific reprise versus typological generation, see Appendix F.

Cyclical *Aethiopis*, the 'Orphic' *Hymn to Demeter*) known through a combination of scanty fragments and a meagre plot summary; and in both cases, the fragmentarily preserved poem can be taken to be an indirect source of the extant poem. The apparently relatively good state of preservation of the 'Orphic' *Hymn to Demeter*, compared to the *Aethiopis*, provides an improved situation by which to assess the possibility of verbatim quotation in the early Greek hexameter tradition; but abiding doubts about our evidence for the 'Orphic' *Hymn to Demeter* complicate the argument.

Chapter 4 takes a methodologically different tack: it argues for the recognition of a phenomenon of 'pregnant tears' as a technique of allusion, related to poetic memory. A character's tears may unconsciously, as their memories may consciously, link them with other characters or with themselves in other situations. But they may link them, more particularly, to characters and situations known to the (ideal) audience from earlier poetry: hence 'pregnant tears' can be considered a technique of allusion. Despite the different approach, this chapter overlaps significantly in content with Chapter 2; several key scenes discussed there are revisited here from the different but complementary perspective of 'pregnant tears': Eurykleia's washing of Odysseus' feet (*Odyssey* XIX), Antilochos' grief at the death of Patroklos (*Iliad* XVII–XVIII), and Thetis' mourning after the death of Patroklos (*Iliad* XVIII). Chapter 2 explored similarities between Homeric and Virgilian techniques of allusion; this chapter finds in poetic memory a remarkably stable form of self-conscious allusion that runs throughout all of early Greek epic, Greek tragedy, and Augustan Latin poetry.

Chapter 5 traces the recurrence of a single motif, seduction by the love goddess, throughout the *Iliad*, *HApH*, and various Near Eastern mythological poetry. This chapter, like Chapter 3, brings a Homeric *Hymn* into the neo-analytical debate, and goes on to investigate possible (indirect) sources for all of *HApH*, the *Iliad*, and *Odyssey* in Sumerian and Babylonian poetry. The Greek hexameter poems are argued to be in a chain of reception reaching back via the second-millennium Babylonian *Gilgamesh* to third-millennium Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna songs. Motifs are passed down this chain with significant changes being rung on them; the principle of opposition in imitation is particularly well illustrated in this chapter. It is not supposed that the early Greek epic poets knew exactly the Mesopotamian texts that have been preserved for us, nor that they must have known them as written texts or in the Akkadian language. But it is suggested that they may have known these poems in some detail as stable narratives (not just as myths or as isolated or even clustered motifs) and may have known their most salient intra- and intertextual relationships. Whereas the previous chapter traced a technique of poetic memory forwards in time from early Greek epic to tragedy and Latin poetry, this chapter traces a poetics of allusion backwards from early Greek epic to Mesopotamian mythological poetry.

1.9 So What?

Why should we care about whether or how Homer alludes? Most basically, it affects our interpretation of individual passages, and of whole poems. More broadly, our understanding of the poetics of the whole early Greek hexameter tradition is at stake. So too, in the broadest of terms, is our conception of literary history: early Greek epic's relation to Mesopotamian poetry, on the one hand, and to Augustan Latin poetry, on the other. It also concerns what we should think our earliest extant literature is capable of, and what an 'oral-derived' poetry is capable of: I have come to the view that there is virtually no limit, within what can be convincingly demonstrated, to the sophistication and self-consciousness that we are entitled to find in Homeric epic. If J. M. Foley's view of 'Homer's traditional art' purposely alienates Homer, makes him more foreign to us (reared on a literary tradition), 'Homer's allusive art' brings him closer: in important ways, Homer is remarkably like what went before (in Mesopotamia) and came after (in Alexandria, in Rome). It may not be a bad thing, and perhaps closer to the truth, if our resulting picture is of a Homer at once foreign and familiar.

The Homeric Epics and their Forerunners

2.1 *Odyssey* Alludes to *Iliad*

The problems of principle and method in supposing that one early Greek epic alludes to another were aired in the previous chapter. The present chapter will try to illustrate how such arguments for allusion fare in practice: first, of the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*; second, of the *Odyssey* to earlier lost poetry on Odysseus' Homecoming; and third, of the *Iliad* to earlier poetry on Achilles and Memnon, available to us only indirectly in epitomized form. Only in our first test case do we have the terra firma offered by two extant and substantial texts, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and so the allusive practices discerned there will be used to inform the discussion of the two other test cases.¹

This chapter will not attempt a demonstration that the *Odyssey* alludes to the *Iliad*, an undertaking which would be lengthy and futile (the demonstration having probably already been made with sufficient cogency to persuade anyone capable of being persuaded).² Here I simply take it for granted that the *Iliad* predates the *Odyssey* and that the *Odyssey* responds to the earlier poem. The priority of the *Iliad* over the *Odyssey* is suggested first by a diachronic study of epic diction.³ (Neither this nor other considerations, however, show that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were not the work of the same poet.)⁴ Moreover, there are compelling literary arguments that the *Odyssey* sees itself as a sequel to the *Iliad*.⁵ (Other early Greek hexameter poems appear to present themselves as sequels: the *Epigoni* to the *Thebaid*, the *Hymn to Pan* to the *Hymn to Hermes*.)⁶ The converse position, that the *Iliad* sees itself (also)

¹ Differently, the *Odyssey*'s allusion to the *Iliad* as distinct from allusion between other early Greek epics: Burgess 2006: 164–5; 2009: 57–8; 2012a: 170 and n. 5; cf. Danek 1998a: 27.

² I rely in particular on R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3); cf. 1992: 2–7. See also Burkert 1960 = 1997; Usener 1990: *passim*; Di Benedetto 2001; Saïd 2011: 373–9.

³ Janko 1982: esp. 189; cf. 83–4. See § 1.4, p. 16.

⁴ Janko 1982: 82, 191; 2012: 33; Macleod 1983: 1; Thalmann 1984: 183; Wachter 2012: 65–6; cf. Danek 1998a: 510–11. Differently, e.g., Heubeck 1954; M. L. West 2011a: 7–8; 2014: 1, 44.

⁵ J. Griffin 1987a: 63–70; 1987b: 101; 1995: 6; Heubeck 1988: 13; Kullmann 1991: 445 = 1992: 121; Di Benedetto 2001: 12; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 76–80.

⁶ *Epigoni*: Cingano 2015: 244, 246. *HPan*: Thomas 2011: 168.

as a prequel to the *Odyssey*, cannot so easily be maintained.⁷ The *Odyssey*'s reception of the *Iliad* is an important part of the *Odyssey*; the *Iliad*'s reception of the *Odyssey*, if any, is comparatively unimportant to the *Iliad*. The *Iliad* was, surely, familiar with epic treatments of the subject matter of Odysseus' homecoming.⁸ But it does not follow that it is familiar with the *Odyssey*: the subject matter of the *Odyssey* was treated repeatedly in hexameter poetry before the *Odyssey* (see § 2.2). The *Odyssey*, by contrast, shows knowledge not only of the subject matter of the *Iliad*, but of the *Iliad*'s distinctive handling of its subject matter (as shall be argued presently). I take the interaction of the *Odyssey* with the *Iliad*, then, to be one-directional.⁹ This excludes the view that *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were not fixed poems but fluid poetic traditions, evolving contemporaneously over an extended period and influencing one another.¹⁰ It may, however, be reconcilable with a more moderate view that there was localized and small-scale influence of the *Odyssey* on the *Iliad*: a modification, not a denial, of the *Iliad*'s essential priority.¹¹

Taking the *Odyssey*'s allusion to the *Iliad* for granted, then, I restrict myself to consideration of its nature. Much of the attention has been directed at establishing whether there may be verbatim quotations of the *Iliad* in the *Odyssey*.¹² But the case for the *Odyssey*'s interaction with the *Iliad* is especially strong when it concerns not just phrases and scenes evoked in the *Iliad*, but also the position and significance that they had in that epic. R. B. Rutherford has demonstrated thematic correspondences with the *Iliad* at equivalent points in the *Odyssey* throughout the poem.¹³ I select just one, particularly revealing, example: the speech of the seer Halitherses to the Ithacan assembly at *Od.* 2.163–76 resembles the speech of Odysseus to the assembled Achaean host at *Il.* 2.300–32 in at least five respects.¹⁴ First, in narrative context: a speech made at an assembly urges (in the *Iliad*) continuance of the long war

⁷ Cf. Σ A *Il.* 4.354a, and other scholia cited by Lentini 2006: 19 n. 1. Cf. Cook 1995: 3–4; Burgess 2006: 163 and 2009: 57; M. L. West 2012: 226; 2014: 25.

⁸ Suggested in particular by Odysseus' apparently traditional periphrases for himself in the *Iliad*: Τηλεμάχοιο πατήρ, Τηλεμάχοιο φίλον πατέρα (2.260, 4.354); Kullmann 1981: 26 = 1992: 85; Hölscher 1988: 30–2; S. R. West 1988: 51; R. B. Rutherford 1992: 18–19; Lentini 2006; M. L. West 2012: 226 and n. 5.

⁹ Cf. R. B. Rutherford 2001: 146 ('additional note' to the original publication of 1991–3).

¹⁰ So Nagy 1979: 8, 41, 42–3; 1990: 53–4 and n. 8; Pucci 1987: 18; Lentini 2006: 14–15; Marks 2008: 9; Mazur 2010–11. → Poem versus song-tradition. Differently again, M. L. West 2011a assumes a *written Iliad* that was fluid for the duration of its poet's lifetime, with the poet editing it in a piecemeal way.

¹¹ Pinsent 1992: 78, 82; N. J. Richardson 1993: 24; cf. J. Griffin 1991: 291; Mueller 2011: 742. Blößner 2006: 35–46 argues for a much more pervasive influence of parts of the *Odyssey* on parts of the *Iliad*.

¹² Usener 1990: 9–182. Cf. Taplin 1990: 109–10; Danek 1998a: 525, 'Index' s.v. 'Iliaszitate, wörtliche'.

¹³ R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 127–30.

¹⁴ See R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 128; Haft 1992; Danek 1998a: 74–5.

effort or (in the *Odyssey*) discontinuance of the long abuse of Odysseus' household. Second, in content: a bird omen (recalled in the *Iliad*, actual in the *Odyssey*) triggers a prophecy at the time of the Achaeans' departure for Troy (*Il.* 2.303–4, *Od.* 2.172–3), which predicts the length of the coming ordeal (ten years for the Achaeans, twenty years for Odysseus; in each case, the final year has arrived), and forecasts eventual success after setbacks. Third, in its narrative form: a prophecy given in the past is recalled by a secondary narrator (Odysseus, Halitherses), in direct and indirect speech respectively (*Il.* 2.323–9, *Od.* 2.174–6); we are dealing, in both cases, with an embedded actorial analepsis.¹⁵ Fourth, in phraseology: the phrase τὰ (δὲ) δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται, 'all these things are now being accomplished', occurs in both passages (*Il.* 2.330, *Od.* 2.176). Fifth, in the position within the poem: both episodes come near the beginning of their respective poems, and both are programmatic, in that they evoke the beginning and the end of their stories (departure for Troy and sacking of Troy, *Il.* 2.303–4 and 329; departure for Troy and killing of the suitors, *Od.* 2.172–3 and 165). By contrast, in the *Cypria*, according to the poem's Summary¹⁶ (Bernabé p. 40, ll. 33–5), the omen at Aulis was narrated about halfway through the poem, not in analepsis and not by a secondary narrator, but by the primary narrator in straightforward narrative sequence (story = fabula).¹⁷ It is probably an idiosyncrasy of the *Iliad* to have transferred the report of this omen from its traditional narrative context, the mustering of troops at Aulis at the beginning of the war, to the last year of the war (as it appears to have done also with its Catalogue of Ships).¹⁸ Thus the *Odyssey* poet 'quotes' the distinctive way that a particular episode was handled in the *Iliad*.¹⁹ We should note, too, that a specific allusion is effected even though the building blocks may be traditional: the 'recalled prophecy' appears to be a traditional motif, and the phrase τὰ (δὲ) δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται to be formulaic.²⁰

¹⁵ 'Actorial analepsis': de Jong 2001: p. xi.

¹⁶ I employ this term, instead of 'Proclus', for reasons set out in Appendix A.

¹⁷ For the omen in this position in the narrative, cf. Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 3.15, Ov. *Met.* 12.11–23, presumably after the *Cypria* in both cases. (Ovid's debt to the Epic Cycle at *Met.* 12.1–13.622: Papaioannou 2007: 3, 14, 21; to the *Cypria* in particular: *ibid.* 51 n. 102, 183 n. 401.) Note P. V. Jones 1992: 74: 'the remains of the Cyclic epics do not suggest that such temporal inversions occurred in them' (but see, differently, Scaife 1995: 172; Rengakos 2015a: 157). 'Story' and 'fabula': de Jong 2001: pp. xiv, xviii.

¹⁸ E.g. Heubeck 1950: 31; Kullmann 1960: 189, 206, 263, 343; Dowden 1996: 55–6; Schein 1997: 352–3; M. L. West 2011a: 32–3.

¹⁹ P. V. Jones 1997: 37: 'there are few, if any passages, where it can be convincingly shown that the *Odyssey* poet is taking on the *Iliad*, as opposed to drawing from a common pool'; however, this passage is one such example. Cf. also Q.S. 8.474–80, with Schmitz 2007: 79: 'Quintus picks up this complex anachrony and makes use of it himself: in a flashback uttered by one of the characters, he points to the same pre-Iliadic event whose fulfilment, however, will fall inside the scope of his own epic text.'

²⁰ 'Recalled prophecy' motif: x 6 *Od.*, x 5 *Il.*; de Jong 2001: 54. τὰ (δὲ) δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται: x 2 *Il.*, x 4 *Od.* → Allusion via typical elements.

Finally, this assumed Odyssean allusion to the *Iliad* would be → meaningful: the *Odyssey* thus equates its action, the return of Odysseus and vengeance on the suitors, with the action of the *Iliad*; a literary relationship, antagonistic or complementary, is signalled.

But the *Odyssey* does not just evoke the *Iliad* at comparable points in each poem. The beginning of the *Odyssey* also picks up the end of the *Iliad*.²¹ The similarities involved are not to be explained as resulting from the use of shared traditional language.²² The intertextuality between *Odyssey* I and *Iliad* XXIV might be seen as an extension of the intratextuality between *Iliad* XXIV and *Iliad* I.²³ *Iliad* XXIV signals closure by echoing the first book of the poem; *Odyssey* I marks out the *Odyssey* as a sequel of the *Iliad* by echoing the ending of that poem. It is under this heading that I wish to analyse the relationship between two narrative sequences which have received less attention than some others, but yield a wealth of illustrative points: Odysseus' entry into Scheria and Priamos' journey to Achilleus' tent (*Od.* 6.255–7.154 and *Il.* 24.281–508 respectively: see Table 2.1 on p. 43).²⁴

The similarities between the two narrative sequences are striking and not diminished by the differences (for instance, that Athene, unlike Hermes with Priamos, does not reveal herself to Odysseus, for the reason given at *Od.* 6.329–31 and 13.339–43).²⁵ The decisive situational similarity consists in the sudden appearance of a suppliant who by divine assistance has managed to infiltrate a society of diners without being noticed (rows 6, 7, and 8 in Table 2.1).²⁶ But the similarities extend forwards and backwards. The same degree of similarity between two passages within either one of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* is likely to warrant talk of intratextuality, and the same degree of similarity between a passage in the *Aeneid* and a passage in *Iliad* or *Odyssey* talk of intertextuality. (Incidentally, our Odyssean passage, *Od.* 7.18–154, has Apollonian and Virgilian intertexts, with which it may in turn be compared: A.R. 3.210–41 and *Aen.* 1.314–493, 586–613.) The question is how far Homeric epic's traditional formulaic character should inhibit this way of

²¹ Schwabl 1982: 18–22; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 131–2; N. J. Richardson 1993: 21–4; Cook 1995: 37–42.

²² N. J. Richardson 1993: 24.

²³ Macleod 1982: 32–4; N. J. Richardson 1993: 1–14, esp. 4–7; Di Benedetto 1994: 177–83. → Intratextuality and intertextuality.

²⁴ See Hainsworth 1988: 321; N. J. Richardson 1993: 309, 321.

²⁵ → Similarities versus differences.

²⁶ Dr S. R. West suggests to me (*per litteras*, 2005) that Odysseus' entry into Scheria might be modelled on Iason's entry into Colchis in lost Argonautic poetry; cf. A.R. 3.210–41, showing various similarities to *Odyssey* VII (Hunter 1989: 121). Apollonius' debts to a non-Homeric Argonautic tradition as against the *Odyssey* itself are notoriously difficult to establish; cf. Hölscher 1988: 178; Garvie 1994: 21. Yet it seems hard to imagine another model for Odysseus' dramatic supplication of Arete (row 7 in Table 2.1) than Priamos' supplication of Achilleus in *Iliad* XXIV.

Table 2.1. *Iliad* 24.281–508 and *Odyssey* 6.255–7.154

<i>Iliad</i> 24.281–508	<i>Odyssey</i> 6.255–7.154
1 Priamos drives a chariot to the Achaean camp; in front, Idaios drives a cart bearing Hektor's ransom (265–80, 322–7).	Odysseus goes by foot to the Phaeacians' city; in front, Nausikaa drives a cart bearing the laundry (6.252–3, 260–1, 317–20).
2 They stop at a location appropriate to an epiphany of Hermes, Ilos' grave (349–51). ²⁷	They stop at a location appropriate to an epiphany of Athene, Athene's grove (6.291–6, 321–2).
3 Priamos receives the disguised Hermes in the likeness of a young man (347–8) as his escort (437, 461).	Odysseus receives the disguised Athene in the likeness of a young woman (7.20) as his guide (7.30).
4 Hermes gives Priamos advice on how to approach Achilleus (465–7).	Athene gives Odysseus advice on how to supplicate Arete (7.50–77).
5 Hermes departs for Olympos (468–9).	Athene departs for her temple in Athens (7.78).
6 Within Achilleus' tent they are concluding a meal when Priamos arrives (475–6).	Within Alkinoos' palace they are concluding a meal when Odysseus arrives (7.49–50, 137–8).
7 Priamos makes a dramatic, sudden appearance and supplicates Achilleus (477–9).	Odysseus makes a dramatic, sudden appearance and supplicates Arete (7.142–3).
8 The first reaction is amazement (482–4).	The first reaction is amazement (7.145).
9 Priamos makes a speech of supplication (486–506).	Odysseus makes a speech of supplication (7.146–52).
10 The verbal response is delayed (507–12).	The verbal response is delayed (7.154–5).
11 The supplication is successful.	The supplication is successful.

thinking about the *Odyssey's* interaction with the *Iliad*. The similarities between the two sequences are not adequately accounted for by supposing one or more underlying type-scenes.²⁸ Even granting such underlying type-scenes, the case for allusion would remain.²⁹ It is relevant, too, that we are dealing with one of the most powerful scenes of the *Iliad*, and doubtless an obvious candidate for allusion.³⁰

The end of the *Iliad* addresses the problem of how the body of Hektor is to be released from Achilleus and restored to his loved ones in Troy. The first

²⁷ The appropriateness of Hermes' appearance at Ilos' grave: J. Griffin 1980a: 23; Herrero de Jáuregui 2011: 43–5; cf. M. W. Edwards 1991: 15–16.

²⁸ The 'visit type-scene' (de Jong 2001: 17 and n. 39) does not go far in accounting for the similarities in question, nor does the 'supplication-scene' (ibid. 178).

²⁹ → Allusion via typical elements.

³⁰ The scene is alluded to at Hdt. 1.88.1: Pelling 2006: 86. It appears to have inspired archaic artists: Friis Johansen 1967: 127–38; Kossatz-Deissmann 1981: 158–9 (cf. *LIMC* s.v. 'Alexandros' no. 71 = 'Priamos' no. 64); Shapiro 1994: 38–45. Differently, Snodgrass 1998: 133; Burgess 2001: 68–70.

books of the *Odyssey* (books I, V, VI, and VII) tackle the problem of how Odysseus, 'dead' to his family (*Od.* 1.161–2, 235–43, and elsewhere), is to be released from Kalypso and the Phaeacians and restored to his loved ones in Ithaca.³¹ In both poems the resolution comes in two movements. The first movement involves, in the *Iliad*, a council of the gods, Apollo's championing of Hektor's cause, Zeus' dispatch of Iris to Thetis, Thetis' conversation with Achilles (*Il.* 24.31–140); and, in the *Odyssey*, a council of the gods, Athene's championing of Odysseus' cause, Zeus' dispatch of Hermes to Kalypso, Kalypso's conversation with Odysseus (*Od.* 1.22–87, 5.1–224). The second movement involves, in the *Iliad*, Priamos' journey to the Achaean camp, Hermes' role as escort, Priamos supplication of Achilles; and, in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus' journey to Scheria, Athene's role as escort, Odysseus' supplication of Arete. We are concerned here with the second movement.

Here, characteristically for Odyssean allusions to the *Iliad*, there is inversion: the hero of the *Iliad* receives the supplication; the hero of the *Odyssey* makes it.³² This suits a general inversion of the active heroism of the *Iliad* to the passive heroism of the *Odyssey*.³³ Achilles inflicts pains (*Il.* 1.2 ἄλγε' ἔθηκε, compare 22.422); Odysseus endures them (*Od.* 1.4 πάθεν ἄλγεα).³⁴ In other supplications by Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, the *Iliad* is also evoked with inversion: Odysseus' supplication of Nausikaa is preceded by a lion simile that evokes the *Iliad* (*Od.* 6.130–6), and Odysseus' supplication of the Kyklops juxtaposes evocation of the Achaeans' great heroism at Troy with their present helplessness (*Od.* 9.263–7).³⁵

Characteristic of the *Odyssey* too is the heightened female presence. In place of Idaios as human charioteer, Hermes as divine escort, and Achilles as person supplicated, the *Odyssey* presents Nausikaa, Athene, Arete in these roles. Odysseus in the *Odyssey* moves in a world of important females.³⁶ The distinctiveness of the *Odyssey's* world is revealed through allusion to the *Iliad*.

So far the case for allusion between the scene of Odysseus' entry into Scheria in *Odyssey* VI–VII and the scene of Priamos' journey to Achilles' tent in *Iliad*

³¹ Odysseus as 'departed' (*Od.* 4.166 οἴχεται, 19.266 ὥχεται) also suggests 'dead': cf., in general, Garvie 2009: 50; see § 4.3, p. 108.

³² In general, Odyssean inversions of the *Iliad*: J. Griffin 1987a: 64, 68, 93–8. → Opposition in imitation.

³³ Cook 1999 = 2009.

³⁴ S. R. West 1988: 67; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 128; Saïd 2011: 375. Not that Achilles does not suffer pains, or Odysseus inflict them (*Od.* 23.306–7); but the comparison still stands. *Il.* 24.7 πάθεν ἄλγεα (Achilleus) is only a partial exception: this and the following are very 'Odyssean' lines (N. J. Richardson 1993: 274–5). This contrast between the respective heroes of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* is replayed in that between Euripides' and Sophocles' heroes: Knox 1964: 5: 'the characteristic Euripidean hero suffers rather than acts'.

³⁵ R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 139–40, on *Od.* 6.130–6.

³⁶ Women in the *Odyssey*: J. Griffin 1987a: 84–6; Schein 1995; Felson and Slatkin 2004; Saïd 2011: 258–314; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 91–7.

XXIV has been made not on the level of wording, but of narrative structure. This may be thought indicative of what an audience of early Greek epic might above all be expected to remember and to recognize. Yet there is also a case to be made for verbatim quotation. Odysseus prays to Athene, ‘grant that I may come to the Phaeacians a welcome guest and pitiable in their eyes’ (*Od.* 6.327 δός μ’ ἐς Φαίηκας φίλον ἐλθεῖν ἦδ’ ἐλεεινόν). Priamos had prayed to Zeus, ‘grant that I may come to Achilleus a welcome guest and pitiable in his eyes’ (*Il.* 24.309 δός μ’ ἐς Ἀχιλλῆος φίλον ἐλθεῖν ἦδ’ ἐλεεινόν).³⁷ No doubt some formulaic language underlies these two passages.³⁸ But the line with which we are concerned is a unique recurrence in Homeric epic, and the content of these two prayers, ‘(grant that) I may come a welcome guest and pitiable’, is quite specific. Priamos’ wish to ‘come pitiable’ is especially apt to his particular situation (compare *Il.* 24.503–4, 357; 22.59).³⁹ We may recognize here, therefore, the possibility of allusion on the level of wording, formulaic and non-formulaic.⁴⁰ The allusion does not depend on verbatim quotation, for the similarities of narrative and situation are sufficient in themselves; but it appears to be reinforced by verbatim quotation.

This putative state of affairs, allusion on the level of narrative structure reinforced by allusion on the level of wording, is arguably seen elsewhere in the *Odyssey*’s interaction with the *Iliad*.⁴¹ Thus, Odysseus’ rejection of Eurymachos’ supplication (*Od.* 22.61–4) resembles two intratextually connected Iliadic scenes: Achilleus’ rejections of the supplications of Agamemnon and Hektor (*Il.* 9.378–87, 22.349–54).⁴² Arguments for an intertextual relationship between this Odyssean and the two Iliadic scenes have tended to concentrate on the similarities of situation and of syntax.⁴³ But there are also striking similarities of wording. The words with which Eurymachos rounds off his promise of recompense to Odysseus are identical with those with which Phoinix pleaded with Achilleus to accept Agamemnon’s proffered recompense (*Od.* 22.59 = *Il.* 9.523 πρὶν δ’ οὐ τι νεμεσσητὸν κεχολῶσθαι, ‘it is by no means blameworthy to have been angry beforehand’). This again is a unique recurrence.⁴⁴ Further, the manner in which Odysseus refuses all gifts, present or

³⁷ Cf. *Od.* 19.253–4, for the combination of ἐλεεινός with φίλος (and αἰδοῖος).

³⁸ For ὥς ἔφατ’ εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ’ ἔκλυε, cf. *Od.* 6.328, *Il.* 24.314. For δός (‘grant [that] ...’), cf. *Il.* 1.37–43, 5.115–21, etc.; *Od.* 3.55–62, etc. See Fenik 1968: 21.

³⁹ Cf. Reinhardt 1961: 477–8. The suppliant’s request for ‘pity’ is of course not unusual, e.g. *Il.* 21.74 = 22.82 = *Od.* 22.312 αἶδεο καὶ μ’ ἐλέησον.

⁴⁰ So Hölscher 1988: 122. Differently, Usener 1990: 181–2.

⁴¹ Usener 1990; Di Benedetto 2001: 8–12.

⁴² On the intratextual connection between *Il.* 9.378–87 and 22.349–54: Macleod 1982: 20–1; J. Griffin 1995: 120.

⁴³ R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 129–30; N. J. Richardson 1993: 142; Schein 1999: 352–6; Bakker 2013: 151–2.

⁴⁴ Considered a ‘formula’ by Saïd 2011: 212.

future, from the suitors, recalls closely the way Achilles refused the largesse of Agamemnon (*Od.* 22.62 ὅσσα τε νῦν ὕμμι' ἐστὶ καὶ εἴ ποθεν ἄλλ' ἐπιθεῖτε ~ *Il.* 9.380 ὅσσά τέ οἱ νῦν ἔστι, καὶ εἴ ποθεν ἄλλα γένοιτο, 'everything you now have and whatever you might add from elsewhere', 'everything he now has and whatever might accrue from elsewhere').⁴⁵ Here, as throughout the *Odyssey*, we are invited to measure Odysseus' heroism against Achilles'.⁴⁶

Another likely candidate for verbatim quotation is Penelope's declaration that she will never receive Odysseus back home, in just the same words in which Thetis had declared she would never again receive Achilles (*Od.* 19.257–8 = *Il.* 18.59–60, 440–1 τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αἶψα / οὔκαδε νοστήσαντα). R. B. Rutherford found irony in the putative quotation: 'Thetis' pathetic prediction is correct, while Penelope's, though expressed with equal anguish is mistaken'.⁴⁷ As a final example we should consider Telemachos' words to Penelope at ⇒ *Od.* 1.356–9, reprising, apparently, Hektor's to Andromache at *Il.* 6.490–3 (ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα κτλ.).⁴⁸ V. Di Benedetto discovered here a similar effect to Rutherford in the preceding example: 'The link between the passages is clear, but the outcome is different, as Hector really dies in the poem, Odysseus does not'.⁴⁹ All these putative verbatim quotations are both striking and (consistently) interpretable. The possibility that certain phrases could mobilize allusion on a verbal level must be taken seriously.⁵⁰

It is obvious that our test case of the *Odyssey*'s interaction with the *Iliad* (*Od.* 6.255–7.154, *Il.* 24.281–508) cannot be seen in isolation, but needs to be considered alongside other, and better known, cases.⁵¹ We have here one good case, alongside many others, for allusion between these two specific poems, *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, in the early epic tradition. The allusion involves 'quotation', both non-verbatim (on the level of narrative sequence) and verbatim. The common features of the two scenes are both marked, in their accumulation, and interpretable (meaningful). An extended Iliadic motif has been transferred to the *Odyssey*, and the audience's recognition of the original context of the motif enriches its appreciation of the Odyssean scene. Here, then, would be a counterexample to the view that it is not the specific Iliadic

⁴⁵ J. Griffin 1995: 120.

⁴⁶ So at *Od.* 5.203–20 Kalypso intimates a heroic choice for Odysseus like that which Thetis intimated for Achilles. *Il.* 9.410–16, but there is inversion (for Odysseus, the homecoming is the heroic choice) and escalation (Odysseus forgoes immortality, not just a long life): R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 133.

⁴⁷ R. B. Rutherford 1992: 172. Differently, 2001 (1991–3): 133 'The shared phraseology here is probably ... too simple and inconspicuous to constitute an allusion.'

⁴⁸ R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 141–2.

⁴⁹ Di Benedetto 2001: 8.

⁵⁰ Cf. also, on *Od.* 22.120–5 and *Il.* 15.478–82, Schwabl 1986: 46; on *Od.* 14.156 and *Il.* 9.312, Mazur 2010–11: 4–9; A. M. Bowie 2013: 189.

⁵¹ See esp. R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3).

context that matters in the *Odyssey*'s allusions to the *Iliad*.⁵² Another general feature to note in this allusion (one to which we will return) is its multiple correspondence: not only does Odysseus evoke the Iliadic Hektor (as the 'dead' person to be restored to his loved ones), he also evokes the Iliadic Priamos (as the suppliant). Likewise, Hermes in *Odyssey* I and V evokes Hermes in *Iliad* XXIV, but Athene in *Odyssey* I also evokes Hermes in *Iliad* XXIV.⁵³

2.2 *Odyssey* Alludes to Earlier Poetry on Odysseus' Homecoming

The *Odyssey*, we have seen, arguably adapts motifs from the *Iliad*. It also alludes, many scholars would allow, to other lost epic poetry: most overtly (i.e., with → signalling) on the voyage of the Argo (*Od.* 12.70) and the labours of Herakles (11.618–19).⁵⁴ It interacts besides with earlier poetry on the homecoming of Odysseus which, like the *nostoi* of other Achaeans, had been a frequent subject of song before the *Odyssey*. The invocation to the Muse in the *Odyssey*'s proem acknowledges earlier treatments of the poem's subject matter: 'from some point in this story, goddess, daughter of Zeus, speak to me too' (*Od.* 1.10).⁵⁵ At the beginning of the *Apologue*, Odysseus shows awareness of himself as a subject of song: 'I am Odysseus son of Laertes, who am well known to all men for my tricks' (*Od.* 9.19–20 *πάσι... / ἀνθρώποισι μέλω*: compare ⇒ *Od.* 12.70 *Ἀργὼν πᾶσι μέλουσα*, 'the Argo, well known to all').⁵⁶

It is the *Odyssey*'s possible interaction with earlier poetry on Odysseus' homecoming that we will consider now. This has been a frequent preoccupation

⁵² Contrast Danek 1998a: 26–7, 62, 63, 367, 469, 509–11; 2002b: 17. Di Benedetto 2001: 7 recognizes both 'generic reuse' and 'individualised reuse' by the *Odyssey* of passages of the *Iliad*: with the former, the poet 'does not want the listener to recognise the link to that single Iliadic passage'; with the latter, it is presupposed 'that the hearer will be able to recall to mind the Iliadic passage that serves as a model'.

⁵³ R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 131.

⁵⁴ In general, M. L. West 2012: 230–3; 2014: 27–32. *Od.* 12.70 acknowledges Argonautic epic poetry (and not just the 'simple story' or 'Märchen' of the voyage of the Argo, *pace* Hölscher 1988): Tsagalis 2014a: 243; cf. 2011: 231–2; further, Kullmann 1991: 449–52 = 1992: 125–9; 2012a: 216–18, 222–3; 2012b: 20–4; M. L. West 2005. *Od.* 11.601–26 acknowledges epic poetry on Herakles: Danek 1998a: 23–4; Dowden 2004: 197; Burgess 2012b: 272–3; sceptically, Andersen 2012.

⁵⁵ With *Od.* 1.10 *τῶν ἀμόθεν γε... εἶπε*, compare 1.339 *τῶν ἔν γε... ᾄειδε*, 8.500 *ἐνθεν ἐλών*. With *Od.* 1.10 *ἡμῖν* of the bard (following 1 *ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε*), compare *Il.* 2.486 *ἡμεῖς* (following 484 *ἔσπετε νῦν μοι*); cf. Hes. *Th.* 1, 36; *HAp* 174–5. On *Od.* 1.10, see Burkert 1987: 48 = 2001: 205; J. M. Foley 1997a: 172; Danek 1998a: 36–7; Scodel 2002: 67–8; differently, Floyd 1969: 135–6.

⁵⁶ Character knowledge tropes the audience's knowledge of other poetry: compare → poetic memory.

of scholarship, especially in connection with Odysseus' 'Cretan tales'.⁵⁷ Here we lack the external control provided by a second extant text; the contours of the earlier poetry with which the *Odyssey* may be interacting can only be inferred from features inherent in the text of the *Odyssey* itself.⁵⁸ Naturally, the arguments will remain tentative and conjectural.

The most important such feature is → narrative inconsistency. We tread here ground first mapped out by analytical scholars, who put the inconsistencies they discovered down to the imperfect combination of independent texts from different authors.⁵⁹ For oralist scholars, a different explanation was at hand: from a unitarian perspective, they were able to ascribe the inconsistencies to the singer's imperfect combination, due to the pressure of composition-in-performance, of independently occurring traditional 'themes'.⁶⁰ A not dissimilar explanation was available to neoanalytical scholars: that the poet was modifying a source or sources, perhaps a version which he had himself previously sung, but inadvertently leaving some details unassimilated to the new context.⁶¹ A refinement on this last position introduces the audience's perspective: the inconsistencies are not on this view an unwitting by-product of the process of composition, whether conceived along oral-formulaic or neoanalytical lines, but a deliberate strategy of allusion.⁶² It is this view, positing a meaningful interaction (allusion) of the *Odyssey* with earlier poetry, that will be developed here.

I concentrate on a single narrative sequence of the *Odyssey* which has attracted attention and controversy, 19.96–604. Inconsistencies have long been felt here.⁶³ To postulate a lost earlier version with which the *Odyssey* is interacting has been one way of making sense of the peculiarities of the *Odyssey*'s narrative.⁶⁴ In Table 2.2 (on p. 49), I use square brackets to emphasize that all elements of the reconstructed alternative version are unattested.

The left-hand column represents an entirely conjectural reconstruction, derived from features that can be observed (and, according to the argument, are meant to be observed) in the text of the *Odyssey*. The *Odyssey*'s narrative deviates from such an alternative narrative so pointedly that it seems

⁵⁷ See Reece 1994; Danek 1998a: 47–9; Steiner 2010: 84–5; Tsagalis 2012: 313–19; cf. Saïd 2011: 183–8.

⁵⁸ Cf. Danek 1998a: 26.

⁵⁹ On the *Odyssey*, Page 1955: 123–4. In general, Kirk 1962: 246–7; Merkelbach 1969: 1–15.

⁶⁰ On the *Odyssey*, Hansen 1972: 6. In general, Lord 1960: 94; Fenik 1974: 50–3; cf. 1964: 53–4; Reece 2005: 61–5.

⁶¹ On *Odyssey*, J. Griffin 1987a: 31–2; M. L. West 2014: (blurb) 'The poet of the *Odyssey* was a seriously flawed genius... With various possible ways of telling the story bubbling up in his mind, he creates a narrative marked by constant inconsistency of detail'; cf. Russo 1992: 7–9; Fernández-Galiano 1992: 183–4. In general, J. T. Kakridis 1949: 8.

⁶² R. B. Rutherford 1992: 35, 36; 2013: 94; Danek 1998a: 7–23, esp. 11–12. In general: § 1.5, p. 28.

⁶³ Page 1955: 123–4, 126–8. Survey of views: Russo 1992: 7–12; Saïd 2011: 298–302.

⁶⁴ Danek 1998a: *passim*; Tsagalis 2011: 220–1.

Table 2.2. *Odyssey* 19.96–604 and a Reconstructed Alternative Homecoming of Odysseus

	Reconstructed alternative version of Odysseus' homecoming	<i>Odyssey</i> 19.96–604
1	[Penelope and Odysseus converse; Penelope recognizes garments which Odysseus is wearing as being of her own making.]	Penelope and 'the beggar' converse; she recognizes the garments that 'the beggar' describes Odysseus as wearing twenty years ago on Crete as being of her making (19.104–334).
2	[Penelope washes Odysseus' feet.]	Eurykleia washes Odysseus' feet (19.386–467).
3	[Penelope recognizes Odysseus.]	Eurykleia recognizes Odysseus; Athene prevents Penelope from recognizing him (19.467–81).
4	[Odysseus and Penelope plot the killing of the suitors.]	Penelope has dreamt of the return of Odysseus and the killing of the suitors; but she does not believe it (19.537–69).
5	[Odysseus tells Penelope to propose the contest of the bow so that he may kill the suitors.]	Penelope moots the contest of the bow, believing that she must take a new husband (19.570–87).

reasonable to say that the audience is constantly required by the text to think in terms of such an alternative narrative.⁶⁵ It is a key question, to which we shall return, whether the alternative narrative is to be conceived as a merely potential alternative or as concretely realized in earlier poetry.⁶⁶ But first the elements in the reconstruction themselves need justification.

Regarding element (1), a preliminary conversation between the two parties is a regular element in recognition scenes (in the *Odyssey*, at least).⁶⁷ It is a more precarious element in the reconstruction that Penelope recognized garments of her making on Odysseus. The suggestion is advanced on the strength of a parallel passage: at *Od.* 7.234–97, Arete recognizes that Odysseus is wearing clothes from her loom.⁶⁸ A number of significant correspondences have been noted between Odysseus' sojourn among the Phaeacians (books

⁶⁵ Danek 1998a: 380–1: 'Our text cites ... the possibility that the recognition takes place at this stage in the plot' (translated).

⁶⁶ Danek 1998a: e.g. 355. Compare §§ 1.6, 4.4. → Reifying alternative version.

⁶⁷ Recognition 'type-scene': Emlyn-Jones 1984: 6–7 = 1998: 131–2; de Jong 2001: 386–7; Gainsford 2003.

⁶⁸ Odysseus took off the clothes made by Kalypso at *Od.* 5.372, and put on those made by Arete (provided by Nausikaa) at 6.228. Consistently with the arguments of this chapter, this might be seen as a way of creating a scene where Odysseus encounters Arete wearing clothes she has made in order to recall a similar traditional scene between Odysseus and Penelope. Comparably, the *Iliad* creates a scene where Achilles battles Hektor with each wearing divinely made armour in order to recall a similar traditional scene between Achilles and Memnon (see § 2.3, p. 61).

VI–VIII) and his experiences on Ithaca (books XIII–XXII).⁶⁹ The correspondence between *Od.* 7.234–97 and 19.213–60 should be reckoned among these. *Od.* 7.234–97 and 19.213–60 would then play off each other, but they may both play off a scene from earlier poetry, too: here, as elsewhere, intratextuality may go hand in hand with intertextuality.⁷⁰ Hypothesizing an alternative narrative with the motif of Penelope recognizing Odysseus by means of her clothes, we would find the *Odyssey* interacting with it twice. In *Odyssey* VII, it would have been transferred to a different person and setting (Arete, Scheria), assuming in the process a quite different narrative function. In *Odyssey* XIX, the motif would be applied, ‘properly’, to Penelope, but rendered remote in three ways. First, the clothes feature only in a narrative of Odysseus, as secondary narrator; they are not seen by Penelope. Second, Odysseus’ narrative is set twenty years in the past. Third, the token of the clothes does not help Penelope to realize that she is face to face with Odysseus, merely that her interlocutor (‘the beggar’, ‘Aithon’) once entertained Odysseus on Crete, in any case a fictional story. The motif thus signifies for her not recognition and reunion with her husband, but continuing ignorance and isolation. It is, of course, intrinsically implausible that Penelope should recognize Odysseus by a garment of her making, after two decades of warfare and seafaring (as one token among others, perhaps); but that does not make its presence implausible in an alternative version of Odysseus’ homecoming. The motif of a woman recognizing a close male relative after a long absence by a garment of her making is well attested in Greek mythology, most famously with the sibling pair Elektra and Orestes.⁷¹ It is to all appearances a folktale motif, just the kind of material we should expect to find in pre-Homeric tradition.⁷² We are not obliged to assume that this motif was necessarily coupled in pre-Homeric tradition with a homecoming of twenty years’ duration; indeed Odysseus’ absence is likely to have been considerably shorter in pre-Homeric tradition.⁷³

⁶⁹ R. B. Rutherford 1985: 140–4; Burgess 2006: 157–8.

⁷⁰ → Intratextuality and intertextuality.

⁷¹ Aesch. *Cho.* 231–2 (cf. Eur. *El.* 539–40, drawing attention to the implausibility of the motif). With a mother–son pair: Eur. *Ion* 1413–25 (Kreousa and Ion); Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* 4.21; cf. 1.2. With a wife–husband pair (Helene and Menelaos): Ar. *Thesm.* 910, reading ἀμφίων (N. G. Wilson 2007: 158–9), would be a punning allusion to the motif.

⁷² Folktale motif: Thompson 1955–8: H110–119: ‘Identification by cloth or clothing’, etc.

⁷³ The absence of the ‘homecoming husband’ of folktale is ‘commonly seven or nine years’ (Hansen 2002: 202); cf., e.g., the Serbian heroic song *The Captivity of Stojan Janković* (Karadžić 1841–62: iii no. 25 ll. 71–8 = Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 261); Hölscher 1988: 51; but cf. Lord 1972: 313. On the lengthening of Odysseus’ *nostos* in the *Odyssey*: J. Griffin 1987a: 65; S. R. West 1988: 51–2 with n. 2. Cf. M. L. West 2014: 3, 103–4, 115–17 (the wanderings lasting three years in pre-Odyssean tradition). This becomes a problematic thirty-year absence once the Teuthranian expedition is incorporated: see Appendix C.

Concerning element (2), it might be thought beneath Penelope's dignity to wash a visitor's feet. But noblewomen in the *Odyssey* do wash feet.⁷⁴ Important light is again thrown on our scene by an earlier passage in the *Odyssey*. In the *Ptocheia* (*Od.* 4.240–64), Helene recounts to Telemachos and Menelaos how Odysseus once entered Troy as a beggar, unrecognized by the Trojans, how she alone recognized him and questioned him, how he evaded her with guile, how she washed and clothed him, how Odysseus swore her to silence and then told her the Achaeans' plans, and how he finally killed many Trojans and returned safely to the Argives. This story, too, foreshadows events in Ithaca.⁷⁵ But it is again possible that intratextuality accompanies intertextuality, that this embedded narrative of Helene's evokes earlier poetry as well as foreshadowing the *Niptra* of book XIX of the *Odyssey*.⁷⁶ 'Old' analytical scholars argued that Eurykleia's foot-washing and recognition of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* were taken over wholesale from an earlier version of the story, in which the recognition of Odysseus by Penelope immediately ensued.⁷⁷ This seems unlikely; it would involve serious anticlimax to have Penelope's recognition of Odysseus thus mediated by Eurykleia.⁷⁸ An alternative is to see the foot-washing and recognition as pointedly transferred in the *Odyssey* from Penelope to Eurykleia. We might then see an explicit acknowledgement of that alternative course of events at 19.476–9: 'she [*sc.* Eurykleia] glanced over to Penelope with her eyes'; in the *Odyssey*, therefore, the drama unravels with Penelope sidelined, or rather held back, significantly, in the wings.⁷⁹ In Chapter 4 (§ 4.6), we will see a further argument that Eurykleia's 'pregnant' tears may help to signal the transference. Finally, Eurykleia's recognition of Odysseus is, as Penelope's would not be, notably without consequence for the plot, and this is what we might expect of a scene standing in for a more consequential one.⁸⁰

Regarding element (3), Athene's intervention to prevent Penelope's recognition of Odysseus appears very contrived.⁸¹ In epic (as in tragedy) the gods sometimes function as embodiments of the poet's will, directing the course of events within the poem.⁸² Athene's intervention here, dispensable as it is, arguably serves to draw attention to the fact that the poet is denying the

⁷⁴ *Od.* 3.464–5 (Polykaste), 4.252 (Helene); S. R. West 1988: 189, 210. In general, for heroes and heroines engaged in menial tasks: J. Griffin 1992 (1986): 29–30.

⁷⁵ *Σ Od.* 4.245c (ed. Pontani); Andersen 1977: 9 and n. 11, 12; S. R. West 1988: 209; Olson 1995: 154; de Jong 2001: 102; Saïd 2011: 145.

⁷⁶ The episode also occurred in the *Little Iliad* (Summary, Bernabé pp. 74–5, ll. 15–16; M. L. West 2013: 196–9). Mythological and literary tradition of the *Ptocheia*: Parca 1991: 75–94, esp. 76–8. Dektes probably a traditional figure: Burgess 2001: 152–3; M. L. West 2013: 195–9; differently, Danek 1998a: 108.

⁷⁷ Page 1955: 128; cf. J. Griffin 1987a: 31.

⁷⁸ Danek 1998a: 380.

⁷⁹ → Character on the sidelines.

⁸⁰ Danek 1998a: 380. → Inconsequentiality.

⁸¹ J. Griffin 1987a: 31.

⁸² → Gods as figures for the poet.

audience a recognition between husband and wife at this point. We may then say that the poet's decision not to have Penelope recognize Odysseus until after the killing of the suitors is figured in the poem here as Athene's intention, a function Athene can be seen as having frequently in the *Odyssey*.⁸³

With respect to (4), it is a logical expectation that in a version in which Odysseus was recognized by Penelope at a relatively early stage that recognition would have been followed by a conspiracy between the couple to kill the suitors.⁸⁴ In the *Odyssey*, as there has been no recognition, there can be no such conspiracy. Yet a plan to kill the suitors is arguably alluded to in Penelope's dream, in which an eagle killed geese in the palace, which Odysseus interprets to her as portending Odysseus' vengeance on the suitors. Thus the couple do discuss Odysseus' killing of the suitors, but in a way that is very far removed from any conspiracy; a conspiracy between Odysseus and Penelope is arguably evoked, but again made remote by being relegated to a dream, and one which Penelope does not even believe.⁸⁵

In element (5) an alternative version is assumed in which Odysseus conceived the contest of the bow as a trap for the suitors.⁸⁶ In the *Odyssey*, Penelope proposes the contest of the bow herself, not as a trap, but in the genuine belief that she must take one of the suitors. In place of complicity, therefore, there is resignation and desperation; Penelope cries herself to sleep, thinking of her *absent* husband (19.571–81, 602–4; cf. 21.56–7).

Narrative inconsistency has played a key part in this reconstruction. The reconstruction envisages the *Odyssey* as conjuring up alternative scenes and sequences of events (or retaining scenes and narrative sequences from earlier poetry), but radically changing their significance. The assumption here of a deliberate narrative strategy is supported by the apparent self-consciousness of the interaction. One way this comes out is through the use of Athene as an arguable figure for the poet's intention. Another is the use of Amphimedon's shade at *Od.* 24.124–85.⁸⁷ Recounting his fate to the shade of Agamemnon, the dead suitor offers a retrospect on the action of the *Odyssey* comparable to that given by Odysseus in the pillow-talk scene of *Od.* 23.310–41.⁸⁸ Amphimedon's account faithfully reports the events of the *Odyssey*, except in three points.⁸⁹ First, he implies that Penelope contrived the murder of the suitors (24.127). Second, he elides the time that elapsed between the discovery of Penelope's trick of the web and Odysseus' return (24.149). Third, he states that Odysseus

⁸³ → Athene, as figure for poet. Rather differently, Schwinge 1993: 27–8, 159.

⁸⁴ Danek 1998a: 390–1; cf. S. R. West 1988: 51 and n. 2.

⁸⁵ Cf. *Od.* 20.88–94.

⁸⁶ Cf. Danek 1998a: 340–1, 354, 483–4.

⁸⁷ Assuming the authenticity of *Odyssey* XXIV (see Erbse 1972 = 1997; de Jong 2001: 561–2, 565–6; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 97–102; cf. Currie 2013). If inauthentic, we must in any event assume a 'continuator' well attuned to the poem's concerns.

⁸⁸ Cf. de Jong 2001: p. xv, 571, seeing both as 'mirror-stories'.

⁸⁹ Danek 1998a: 478; de Jong 2001: 571.

put Penelope up to proposing the contest of the bow to achieve their destruction (24.167–9). Strictly, this is not narrative inconsistency, since the discrepancies between Amphimedon's version and the action of the *Odyssey* can be adequately put down to the subjectively coloured and epistemically limited perspective of the secondary narrator.⁹⁰ Yet Amphimedon's version strikingly agrees with the alternative version that we reconstructed from features within the narrative of book XIX, especially his insistence on a recognition between husband and wife before the killing of the suitors and on Penelope's complicity in that slaughter. 'Old' analysts supposed that the poet of this part of the *Odyssey* had failed to integrate his version of the Homecoming with the (main) version of the *Odyssey*.⁹¹ More attractively, the *Odyssey* poet (again assuming the authenticity of this part of the poem) may be seen as exploiting the dead suitor's perspective in order once again to juxtapose his version of Odysseus' homecoming with that of an alternative (actual or potential).⁹² The two versions, that of the *Odyssey* and its putative predecessor, would coexist in Amphimedon's 'mirror-story' so as to highlight the story the *Odyssey* poet could have told, but did not.⁹³ A → *nekyia*, moreover, is an especially fitting place for a poem to explore self-reflectively its relationship to earlier poetry, to confront its own literary ghosts.⁹⁴ Amphimedon's shade may also have encouraged the audience to recall earlier poetic tradition at ⇒ 24.115 ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὄτ'ε...; (for the apparent mythological reference there, compare *Cypria*, Summary Bernabé p. 40, ll. 30–3, and see § 4.9).

Can we assume that the *Odyssey* really was interacting with earlier poetry, with roughly the contours that we have reconstructed for it here?⁹⁵ An alternative way of accounting in general for the allusive quality of the *Odyssey*'s narrative is to take the *Odyssey* poet to exploit, not knowledge of earlier poetry, but audience familiarity with type-scenes, for instance, of recognition.⁹⁶ But the expectations of plot development that we have seen that the poet calls up here, and cleverly frustrates, are hardly the expectations created only by type-scenes. Or we might prefer to speak in terms of 'misdirection', the poet simply playing with possible ways that his narrative might have gone, but

⁹⁰ Erbse 1972: 76–7; J. Griffin 1987a: 30; Heubeck 1992: 374; Danek 1998a: 479–81; de Jong 2001: 571–2.

⁹¹ Page 1955: 120–3. ⁹² Danek 1998a: 478–84; cf. Segal 1992: 11–12.

⁹³ → Character-text; → lying tales.

⁹⁴ *Od.* 24.196–202, in the *Deuteronekyia*, 'comes very close to self-reference' (R. B. Rutherford 2013: 79). At *Od.* 11.482–91, in the first *Nekyia*, the *Odyssey* is implicitly compared with the *Iliad* through comparison of their respective heroes, Achilles and Odysseus; compare, in the *Deuteronekyia*, *Od.* 24.36–7, 93–4, 192–3, 196. The *Odyssey* confronts earlier Herakles poetry at 11.601–26, and earlier Catalogue of Women poetry at 11.225–332 (Hirschberger 2001; I. C. Rutherford 2012: 161–4). Danek 1998a: 231.

⁹⁵ Cf. Danek 1998a: 381–2.

⁹⁶ Cf. Emlyn-Jones 1984: 8–9 = 1998: 133; Danek 1998a: 27–8.

does not.⁹⁷ Or, again, we may see him as interacting with a purely theoretical *Urform*, or → 'simple story', of Odysseus' homecoming, a canonical 'fabula' known to the poem's public, distinct from any concretely performed version.⁹⁸ Ultimately this question seems bound to be settled in terms of the individual interpreter's theoretical preferences.⁹⁹ We have seen the likelihood of the *Odyssey* alluding to earlier poetry in the case of the *Iliad*; it is a possibility, at least, that it does so also in the case of earlier poetry on Odysseus' homecoming. It is noteworthy that the hypothetical reconstructed version is not just conjured up by the narrative of book XIX; it will be alluded to, according to the foregoing, in books IV (Helene's foot-washing and recognition of Odysseus), VII (Arete's recognition of her own loom work on Odysseus), and XXIV (Amphimedon's assumption of a husband-wife conspiracy in the contest of the bow). This seems to speak against the view that the poet is simply playing with possible ways in which his narrative may have gone, and to speak for interaction with something more concrete and tangible. The self-consciousness, moreover, detected in the *Odyssey's* narrative may suggest a competitive relationship with real songs rather than with purely notional rival versions.

If we assume allusion to earlier poetry on the homecoming of Odysseus, then here too, as with the *Odyssey's* allusion to the *Iliad*, it will be a creative one; here too we will have inversion, motifs turned on their head. In both cases, rather than pursuing a 'rhetoric of traditionality', that earlier poetry will be arguably evoked in order to point up the individuality of the present poetic treatment.¹⁰⁰ The narrative elements that in an earlier version conduced to a recognition between husband and wife and to their conspiracy against the suitors will have been given a quite different signification in the *Odyssey*. The kind of adherence to an earlier version, combined with pointed departure from it, that is envisaged here should be seen as a deliberate narrative strategy, not an unwitting by-product of oral composition: a very different kind of Homeric 'nod'. The earlier version on such a view remains vestigially present in the text so that the innovation of the *Odyssey* may be apparent to and appreciated by the audience. To that extent narrative inconsistency can be seen as a form of 'quotation'. One may assume that a major challenge facing the singer (as, later, the tragic poets) was to offer different interpretations of well-worn plots. The innovations of the *Odyssey* created enormous potential for dramatic irony, and enabled the climactic recognition of Odysseus by Penelope to be kept back in reserve. They also had major implications for

⁹⁷ Goldhill 1988: 6. See, in general, on 'misdirection', J. V. Morrison 1992a; de Jong 2001: xv and n. 32.

⁹⁸ See Hölscher 1988: 27–8.

⁹⁹ For the possibility of interaction with one or more real antecedent poetic treatment(s), cf. Danek 1998a: 482–4; cf. 15. Differently, Hölscher 1988: 33.

¹⁰⁰ 'Rhetoric of traditionality': Scodel 2002: 92.

characterization: Penelope becomes exceptionally isolated and long-suffering, a near-tragic figure in her own right; Odysseus becomes excessively cautious, almost addicted to disguise, a tendency taken to its extreme with Laertes in book XXIV.¹⁰¹

2.3 *Iliad* Alludes to Earlier Epic Poetry on Memnon

The *Iliad* interacts with a wide range of earlier poetry, Greek and Near Eastern.¹⁰² Here we shall consider, as a third test case, the question of its interaction with lost epic poetry on the Ethiopian hero Memnon. The *Iliad* can be argued to engage in the reception not just of isolated motifs, but of an extensive epic narrative sequence on Memnon. As with our previous test case, the argument here must depend heavily on features of the extant poem (this time the *Iliad*), but unlike with the previous case, these arguments may be supplemented by extant *testimonia* to a lost, but not hypothetical, poem: the *Aethiopis*. There are virtually no extant fragments of the *Aethiopis*, but its basic contents are known, chiefly from a summary of the Trojan Cycle poems preserved in the Venetus A manuscript of the *Iliad*. This summary is either that made (not necessarily from first-hand acquaintance with the Cyclical epics) by Proclus (either the well-known Neoplatonist of the fifth century AD or an obscure scholar of the second century AD), or it may be a (modified?) summary of Proclus' original summary.¹⁰³ The *Aethiopis* was current in the archaic and classical periods; it was known to the artists of that period, the lyric poets (Alcman, Pindar), and the tragedians.¹⁰⁴ At some point (not later than the Hellenistic period, but perhaps not before) it was incorporated into a 'Cycle' along with other archaic epics; it may have undergone some modification in the process.¹⁰⁵ It was accessible in this form to the scholars of Alexandria, and perhaps to Virgil and Ovid; it was still ostensibly being read

¹⁰¹ Innovations in plot as entailing innovations in characterization: J. Griffin 1995: 20–1; cf. 1980a: 73–4. Odysseus and Laertes in *Odyssey* XXIV: R. B. Rutherford 2013: 100.

¹⁰² Kullmann 1991: 429–33 = 1992: 104–8; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 6–14. Interaction with Near Eastern motifs: see §§ 5.10, 5.19.

¹⁰³ The fifth-century Neo-Platonist: Suda π 2473, etc. (the only view in antiquity); Longo 1995; cf. Allen 1908: 64–5; Lamberton 1986: 177–8 with n. 51; Scafoglio 2004a: 40–1. A second-century grammarian: Hillgruber 1990; I. C. Rutherford 2001: 101–2 and n. 31; M. L. West 2013: 7–11. On the questions whether Proclus read the poems at first-hand and whether the Venetus A preserves Proclus' summaries in a modified or unmodified form, see Appendix A.

¹⁰⁴ Burgess 2001: 45 and 208 nn. 133–4. Cf. Pind. fr. 265 Maehler; Soph. test. 136 TGrF. Knowledge in the archaic and classical periods of the epics later incorporated in the 'Cycle': Burgess 2005a: 347–8.

¹⁰⁵ An apparent *terminus ante quem* for the existence of the 'Cycle' is Callim. *Ep.* 28.1 (= *AP* 12.43.1): Burgess 2001 8; 2005a: 347–8; Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 96 n. 30. M. L. West 2013: 23–6 dates its creation to 350–320 BC. See Appendix A.

in the second century AD, when it is cited by Pausanias and Athenaeus.¹⁰⁶ The *Aethiopis* is, on the conventional dating, later than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. However, the *Odyssey* is clearly already familiar with (some of) the subject matter of the *Aethiopis* (*Od.* 4.187–8, 11.522).¹⁰⁷ It has therefore become conventional to refer to the poetry on this theme that was known to the *Odyssey* (and arguably also to the *Iliad*) as the **Memnonis*.¹⁰⁸ The **Memnonis* is then, like the *Aethiopis*, a lost product of the early epic tradition, but unlike the *Aethiopis* its existence is only hypothesized, not actually attested (the accompanying asterisk signals this fact). This hypothetical lost poetry is assumed to have the same subject matter as the later *Aethiopis*, although the story of the Amazon Penthesileia, prefaced in that poem to the story of Memnon (Summary, Bernabé pp. 67–8, ll. 4–8), may be alien to the **Memnonis*.¹⁰⁹ The conceptual distinctness of **Memnonis* and *Aethiopis* is important: the (perhaps only oral) poetry known to the *Odyssey* (almost certainly) and to the *Iliad* (arguably) is taken to be the **Memnonis*, while the poem known to classical and later authors (Pindar, Virgil, and others) is the *Aethiopis*. However, the distinction is collapsible: it cannot be excluded that we are dealing with one poem, if it turns out that the *Aethiopis* is earlier than the Homeric epics.¹¹⁰ Nor should we too readily assume that the '**Memnonis*' is a stable poem, rather than a more amorphous body of pre-Homeric poetry on the theme of Memnon and Achilleus; many scholars conceive of the **Memnonis* as a fluid 'song-tradition' rather than a specific, fixed poem.¹¹¹

The interaction of the *Iliad* and **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) has received a great deal of attention, especially from neoanalysts and their critics. There has been much disagreement about the nature of the interaction. The **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) has both been claimed as a 'source' for the *Iliad* and been seen as derived from the *Iliad*; moreover, all interaction between *Iliad* and **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) has been denied, both epics being viewed as instances of the same 'oral typology'.¹¹² The similarities between the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) and the *Iliad* are indeed striking, both on a grand structural level and on the level of detail. Tables 2.3 and 2.4 show just the most fundamental similarities; I put the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) in the left-hand column, without yet committing to a

¹⁰⁶ M. L. West 2013: 47–51; cf. Burgess 2001: 198 n. 29. But see, sceptically, on Pausanias' knowledge of the Cycle, Horsfall 2003: 469–70. Athenaeus may owe his knowledge of the fragments of the *Cypria* to a commentary of Aristarchus: Severyns 1928: 132–7; Braswell 1982: 225 n. 23; differently, Burgess 1996: 89 n. 47; M. L. West 2013: 50. → Virgil and Epic Cycle.

¹⁰⁷ Heubeck 1989: 105; 1992: 361–2; M. L. West 2012: 230, 238.

¹⁰⁸ e.g. Schoeck 1961; Seaford 1994: 154–9; M. L. West 2003b: 3.

¹⁰⁹ Pestalozzi 1945: 5; M. L. West 2003b: 13; cf. 14; 2013: 133.

¹¹⁰ Kullmann 1991: 429–30 = 1992: 104–5; Dowden 1996: 48–9.

¹¹¹ e.g. Tsagalis 2008: 67–8; Burgess 2009: 60. See § 1.4.

¹¹² For the last view, cf. Notopoulos 1964: 35; Fenik 1968: 235; Hainsworth 1969: 31; cf. Kirk 1990: 27. Differently, e.g., Kullmann 1984: 315 = 1992: 147–8; M. W. Edwards 1991: 17; Janko 1992: 372; cf. Janko 1982: 225–6; Dowden 1996: 56.

Table 2.3. **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* and *Iliad*, I: Achilleus in **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* corresponds to Achilleus in *Iliad*

* <i>Memnonis (Aethiopsis)</i>	<i>Iliad</i>
1 Achilleus receives a prophecy from Thetis about Memnon (<i>Aethiopsis</i> Summary Bernabé p. 68, l. 12) [and withdraws from battle].	Achilleus is enraged with Agamemnon and withdraws from battle (1.240–4).
2 [Antilochos fights in Achilleus' absence.]	Patroklos fights instead of Achilleus (16.36–100).
3 Memnon kills Antilochos (<i>Aethiopsis</i> Summary Bernabé p. 68, l. 13).	Hektor kills Patroklos (16.818–57).
4 Achilleus kills Memnon (<i>Aethiopsis</i> Summary Bernabé p. 68, l. 14).	Achilleus kills Hektor (22.322–63).
5 Paris and Apollo kill Achilleus (<i>Aethiopsis</i> Summary Bernabé p. 69, l. 16).	Paris and Apollo will kill Achilleus (22.359–60: external prolepsis).

Table 2.4. **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* and *Iliad*, II: Achilleus in **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* corresponds to Patroklos in *Iliad*

* <i>Memnonis (Aethiopsis)</i>	<i>Iliad</i>
4 Achilleus kills Memnon (<i>Aethiopsis</i> Summary Bernabé p. 68, l. 14).	Patroklos kills Sarpedon (16.480–505).
5 Achilleus falls at the hands of Paris and Apollo [at the Scaean gates] (<i>Aethiopsis</i> Summary Bernabé p. 69, l. 16; Ps.-Apollod. <i>Epit.</i> 20.1; cf. <i>Il.</i> 22.360).	Patroklos falls at the hands of Euphorbos and Hektor and Apollo (at the Scaean gates?) (16.788–857).
6 Battle over the corpse of Achilleus, removed by Aias and Odysseus (<i>Aethiopsis</i> Summary Bernabé p. 69, ll. 17–18; cf. <i>Aethiopsis</i> fr. 3 Bernabé).	Battle over the corpse of Patroklos, removed by the two Aiantes with Meriones and Menelaos (17.715–61, 18.151–64).
7 Mourning for Achilleus by Thetis and Nereids and Muses (<i>Aethiopsis</i> Summary Bernabé p. 69, ll. 20–1; cf. <i>Od.</i> 24.47–62).	Mourning after Patroklos' death by Thetis and the Nereids (18.35–71).
8 Funeral and funeral games for Achilleus (<i>Aethiopsis</i> Summary Bernabé p. 69, ll. 19–23; cf. <i>Od.</i> 24.85–92).	Funeral and funeral games for Patroklos (23.110–897).

view on priority. The situation is further complicated as the interaction seems to come in two overlapping episodes: one in which the part of Achilleus in the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* corresponds to the part of Achilleus in the *Iliad*, one in which the part of Achilleus in the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* corresponds to the part of Patroklos in the *Iliad*. Again, I put in square brackets those details which are not actually attested.

The argument that the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* is a 'source' for the *Iliad* has been a cornerstone of neoanalytical scholarship and has increasingly gained

acceptance.¹¹³ But there have been two notable recent challenges which must occupy us now.¹¹⁴

J. S. Burgess has doubted whether the Iliadic theme of Achilles' vengeance on Hektor for his killing of Patroklos is modelled on Achilles' vengeance on Memnon for his killing of Antilochos in the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*, questioning whether the killing of Memnon was presented as an act of vengeance at all in the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*.¹¹⁵ His scepticism is justified by the fact that the Summary of the *Aethiopis* does not explicitly present Achilles' killing of Memnon as a vengeance killing. (Quintus, for what it is worth, does: 2.388–401, 447–8, 3.10.)¹¹⁶ Burgess's position amounts to a denial of the full set of correspondences in Table 2.3, but an endorsement of those in Table 2.4. Its most crucial consequence is that Antilochos in the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* will not be a model for Patroklos in the *Iliad*.¹¹⁷ The reason for this denial is that the Iliadic Patroklos is clearly modelled on Achilles in the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*.¹¹⁸ The main concern here is that the Iliadic Patroklos should not simultaneously have two prototypes in the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*; this concern will be addressed later.¹¹⁹ For now it must suffice to register three arguments for adhering to the standard neoanalytical view that the Homeric Patroklos is modelled on the pre-Homeric Antilochos.

First, the mythologies of Antilochos and Patroklos are parallel in ways that suggest dependence rather than coincidence or typology, especially when taken in connection with the other parallels between the *Iliad* and **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* which resist typological explanation.¹²⁰ Second, the *Iliad* itself seems to take a very pointed interest in the parallelism of Patroklos and Antilochos, a fact which tends to confirm the argument for dependence: Antilochos' tearful approach to Achilles at the beginning of book XVIII powerfully echoes Patroklos' tearful approach to Achilles at the beginning of book XVI.¹²¹ This intratextual relationship within the *Iliad* between Patroklos and Antilochos might be seen as building on an intertextual

¹¹³ D. L. Cairns 2001: 42: 'established beyond any reasonable doubt'; cf. Danek 1998a: 24–5; Rengakos 2015b: 315–16.

¹¹⁴ Counter-challenges include Kullmann 2005; Sbardella 2011: 38–9 n. 21. On Kelly 2006 and 2012, see Appendices D and E.

¹¹⁵ Burgess 1997; cf. 2005b: 122; 2009: 73, 79–80, 93; echoed by Allan 2005: 14 and n. 61; Kelly 2006: 6.

¹¹⁶ Burgess 1997: 8 and 10 perhaps underestimates the significance of this.

¹¹⁷ For statements of the other view, cf., e.g., Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 178–81; Willcock 1983; Kullmann 2005; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 120.

¹¹⁸ M. L. West 2003b: 10–11 also contests the significance attached by neoanalysts to Antilochos in the *Iliad*. See, in answer, Kullmann 2005: 16–25.

¹¹⁹ → Multiple correspondence.

¹²⁰ See Kullmann 1984: 315 = 1992: 147–8; Janko 1992: 372; Dowden 1996: 56. Differently, Burgess 1997: 13; cf. 2009: 80.

¹²¹ *Il.* 18.1–2, 17 ~ 16.1–3. See M. W. Edwards 1991: 143; cf. Reinhardt 1961: 357; Schwabl 1986: 59; Di Benedetto 1994: 112.

relationship between the *Iliad* and **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*.¹²² Accordingly the juxtaposition of Antilochos with Patroklos in this part of the *Iliad* may be regarded as a way in which the *Iliad* implicitly acknowledges that its Patroklos is modelled on the Antilochos of the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*.¹²³ (Antilochos is also associated with Patroklos through being uniquely powerfully affected by the news of Patroklos' death, *Il.* 17.695–6; see § 4.5.)¹²⁴ Third, a passage from the *Odyssey* seems to confirm the parallelism of Antilochos and Patroklos and, perhaps, to affirm it as the creation of the *Iliad*. The description in the *Deuteronekyia* of the joint burial of Achilleus, Patroklos, and Antilochos ($\Rightarrow$ *Od.* 24.76–9; compare also 11.468 = 24.16) has often been seen as an acknowledgement by the *Odyssey* poet of the *Iliad*'s transference of the traditional friendship of Achilleus and Antilochos in the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* to Achilleus and Patroklos in the *Iliad*.¹²⁵ It seems unlikely that in pre-Homeric tradition Achilleus was furnished with more than one 'best' friend.¹²⁶ His possession of two here is plausibly seen as the consequence of the *Odyssey*'s deliberate accommodation of the *Iliad*'s version to that of the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*.¹²⁷

M. L. West has more radically contested the relationship between the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* and the *Iliad* maintained by neoanalysts.¹²⁸ Rather than the *Iliad* reacting to a pre-Iliadic **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*, he considers the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* and its hero Memnon to be post-Iliadic creations. On West's view, the *Iliad* interacts instead with a different earlier poem on the same theme by the *Iliad* poet himself, though West conceives this less in terms of an allusive interaction than a poet's 'change of mind'.¹²⁹ For West, crucially,

¹²² → Intratextuality and intertextuality.

¹²³ Cf. Willcock 1987: 190–2; cf. 1983. → Signalling.

¹²⁴ Cf. Reinhardt 1961: 357.

¹²⁵ Kullmann 1960: 42; 1991: 445–6 = 1992: 121; Reinhardt 1961: 362; Willcock 1983: 484; A. T. Edwards 1985: 223–7; M. W. Edwards 1990: 312; Haslam 1991: 37 and nn. 5–6; Ford 1992: 158–60; Heubeck 1992: 368; Janko 1992: 314; Danek 1998a: 475. *Od.* 24.77–9 asserts the priority of Patroklos over Antilochos as Achilleus' dearest friend; this is best taken as playfully inverting the known relationship of *Iliad* and **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* (differently, Willcock 1973: 8). Erbse 1993: 401 disputes the close friendship between Achilleus and Antilochos.

¹²⁶ Burgess 1997: 11: 'a hero may have more than one friend' (cf. Burgess 2009: 105: 'a tradition in which the three heroes were buried together'). However, a single friend is the heroic norm (M. W. Edwards 1987a: 63): Gilgamesh and Enkidu (*Gilgamesh*), Roland and Oliver (*Chanson de Roland*), and, in Greek mythology, Herakles and Iolaos, Theseus and Peirithoos, Orestes and Pylades.

¹²⁷ See further Appendix C.

¹²⁸ M. L. West 2003b; cf. 2003a: 14–15; 2013: 41–2, 135, 145, 149–50. Contrast, e.g., J. T. Kakridis 1949: 93–4; Dowden 1996: 56.

¹²⁹ M. L. West 2003b: 8 = 2011b: 253; 2013: 150. Differently, Macleod 1982: 28: 'This is no doubt a planned surprise.' West argued repeatedly for such a view of the composition of epic (and non-epic: M. L. West 1987: 40) poetry; essentially this is another attempt (like neoanalysis) to accommodate analytical arguments to a unitarian position. See, on *Od.* 1.93 and 1.285, M. L. West 1998: 100; cf. 2014: 108; critiqued: Danek 1998a: 48: 'the thesis is implausible that Homer changed his mind in the course of the narrative' (translated). Similarly, M. L. West 1978: 44: 'We can often see them [sc. the epic poets] having new ideas as they go'; cf. M. L. West 1981:

neither Hektor nor Sarpedon in the *Iliad* is modelled on Memnon in an earlier epic. West makes a number of fundamental objections to a pre-Iliadic **Memnonis* which cannot all be addressed here.¹³⁰ I will focus on two specific points of contact between the *Iliad* and **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) and attempt to determine the likely direction of influence: the armour made by Hephaistos and Thetis' prophecy.

First, the armour made by Hephaistos. In the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*), Memnon had a suit of armour made by Hephaistos (Summary, Bernabé p. 68, ll. 10–11); so too, doubtless, did Achilles, though the Summary does not explicitly say so. In the *Iliad*, Achilles likewise receives arms made by Hephaistos (18.369–19.13). In West's view, divine armour 'ought to be the special property of one hero, not two, and Achilles' set, fully and naturally accounted for as it is in the *Iliad*, is clearly primary, Memnon's wantonly derivative'.¹³¹ Yet the set of arms Achilles receives at *Il.* 19.12–13 is his second set, and the second to have been made by Hephaistos.¹³² The first was a gift of the gods to Peleus at his wedding and was given by him to his son (17.194–7, 18.84–5; compare and contrast Eur. *IA* 1067–75; given by Thetis to Achilles).¹³³ It was then lent by Achilles to Patroklos (16.130–44), lost by Patroklos to Hektor (17.125), and finally recovered by Achilles when he killed Hektor (22.368). The lending of the arms to Patroklos and their subsequent loss is plainly untraditional: it has the famous consequence that

64–7 = 2011*b*: 156–8; critiqued: M. Heath 1985: 247: 'West offers us a Hesiod who is constantly having to extricate himself from the tight corners in which he has trapped himself by failing to think more than a few lines ahead; the composition of the poem is thus portrayed as a sequence of cliff-hanging escapades.' M. L. West 2001*a*: 158, 265–6; 2011*a*: *passim*, esp. 3, 10–14; 2014: *passim*, e.g. 66, 93, 141, on a single author's successive changes of mind. Cf. S. R. West 2012*a*, esp. 122. For difficulties with West's notion of Homer 'literally cutting...and pasting' (M. L. West 2011*a*: 14), see, on the analogous assumption with Herodotus, Lattimore 1958, esp. 9–10; Rösler 2002: 83–4; differently, Bravo 2000: 28 n. 10. A similar approach to the composition of the *Iliad*: Mueller 2009: 173–86.

¹³⁰ M. L. West 2003*b*: 6–7, 9 = 2011*b*: 250–1 argues that the mythology of the Ethiopians and esp. Memnon is a post-Iliadic development; contra, Burgess 2004; Kullmann 2005: 14–15, 21–4 (and cf. already Kullmann 1960: 43; 1991: 439, 441 n. 69 = 1992: 114–15, 116 n. 69). Although the Ethiopians are removed from the world of the heroes in the *Iliad*, this does not necessarily reflect an older strand. Ethiopians are listed alongside real regions and peoples at *Od.* 4.83–5; the personal name *Αἰθίοψ* is found in Mycenaean (*a₃-ti-jo-qo*): Aura Jorro and Adrados 1985–93: i.140; Morris 1997: 615. A mythical tradition passed over by Homer is not necessarily unknown to him (Dowden 1989: 11–12; 1996: 52–3; Kullmann 2005: 14–15, 16–17, 25–8), and in the case of the Ethiopians, suppression in the *Iliad* seems more likely than ignorance (cf. J. Griffin 1977: 367–8). West's construction of a chronological sequence *Iliad*–**Memnonis*–*Odyssey*–*Aethiopsis* (M. L. West 2003*b*: 12; 2012: 229, 238) imposes greater precision than the subject matter allows: the mythology of Memnon, demonstrably older than the *Odyssey* (4.187–8, 11.522, 24.78, and *Theogony*, 984–5), may be considered simply 'pre-Homeric'; there is insufficient ground to declare it pre-Odyssean and post-Iliadic (Burgess 2004; 2009: 28, 29; cf. Heubeck 1950: 19).

¹³¹ M. L. West 2003*b*: 10. Cf. Hölscher 1955: 396.

¹³² Peleus' set made by Hephaistos: P. J. Kakridis 1961: 290 and n. 2.

¹³³ Kossatz-Deissmann 1981: 69–72 esp. 71–2.

Achilleus after Hektor's death ends up with two sets of arms made by Hephaistos, leaving no scope for the traditional contest of Achilleus' arms (*Hoplōn krisis*) between Odysseus and Aias.¹³⁴ This Iliadic innovation has various poetic advantages.¹³⁵ One is to bring Achilleus and Hektor face to face, each in armour made by Hephaistos. Thus by means of a palpable innovation the *Iliad* creates a scene which was central to the **Memnonis* (*Aethiōpis*).¹³⁶ It is reasonable, I think, to see this as a way in which the *Iliad* 'quotes' the **Memnonis* (*Aethiōpis*). It is, moreover, likely that in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiōpis*) the divinely made armour was impenetrable, and that this was the rationale of divinely made weapons in the epic tradition.¹³⁷ The *Iliad* would then have retained the motif of the divinely made weapons, and the divine mother's concern to furnish her son with them (compare 18.189–91), but, insistently, as objects of beauty, rather than a means of preserving him from death (18.464–7; compare 18.144, 191, 22.323).¹³⁸ We seem to have here a pointed manipulation of motifs comparable to what we have observed with the *Odyssey*. There are, moreover, reflections in the *Iliad* of the notion that divinely made armour was impenetrable (20.264–6, 20.268, 21.594).¹³⁹ We have an instance, therefore, of narrative inconsistency, but again we need not suppose that the poet is unhappily straddling two versions.¹⁴⁰ As in our discussion of the *Odyssey*, this may be seen as a way for the *Iliad* poet of pointedly evoking a traditional conception while diverging from it. The Iliadic treatment of the arms made by Hephaistos is thus consistent not only with the priority of the **Memnonis* (*Aethiōpis*) over the *Iliad*, but also with the *Iliad*'s interaction with that earlier poetry.¹⁴¹

Second, Thetis' prophecy. In the *Iliad*, Achilleus is warned by Thetis that his death is fated to follow 'straight after Hektor's' (18.96). In the **Memnonis* (*Aethiōpis*), Thetis probably foretold to Achilleus that he would die if he killed Memnon—if that is what is intended by the Summary's clipped sentence 'Thetis foretold to her son the matters pertaining to Memnon' (Bernabé p. 68, l. 12). M. L. West sees the prophecy of Thetis in the **Memnonis*

¹³⁴ P. J. Kakridis 1961: 289; cf. Pestalozzi 1945: 51–2; M. W. Edwards 1991: 40; Janko 1992: 310; Burgess 2001: 39–40; Kullmann 2015: 113–14. See Appendix C.

¹³⁵ Cf. M. W. Edwards 1987b: 57–8; J. Heath 1992: 392 n. 14; Janko 1992: 311.

¹³⁶ Cf. M. W. Edwards 1991: 19. Cf. Q.S. 2.455. The duel between Aeneas and Turnus in *Aeneid* XII combines elements of Achilleus–Memnon and Achilleus–Hektor: Aeneas and Turnus both have weapons made by Vulcan; both have a divine mother and a human father (cf. Tarrant 2012: 14–15).

¹³⁷ P. J. Kakridis 1961; cf. Berthold 1911: 37–8; J. Griffin 1977: 368; J. Heath 1992: 391; Slatkin 2001: 417; de Jong 2012: 139.

¹³⁸ Cf. J. Griffin 1977: 368; M. W. Edwards 1991: 140.

¹³⁹ Cf. also *Il.* 16.793–804; 22.322–7. See P. J. Kakridis 1961: 291–4; M. W. Edwards 1991: 322; cf. 139.

¹⁴⁰ Contrast P. J. Kakridis 1961: 297.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Kullmann 2005: 16.

(*Aethiopsis*) as inspired by *Il.* 18.96.¹⁴² Yet the theme of Thetis' prophecy in the *Iliad* is handled in a way that appears to presuppose its previous deployment.¹⁴³ The possibility that Achilles has withdrawn from the fighting out of reverence for a prophecy from Thetis is raised, significantly, by secondary narrators (Nestor and Patroklos) (11.794–7 = 16.36–9: in a conditional clause); it is emphatically repudiated by Achilles himself (16.50–1). The *Iliad* thus insists that Achilles is *not* influenced by a prophecy from his goddess mother, but at the same time arguably reminds the audience of earlier poetry (**Memnonis (Aethiopsis)?*) in which he was. The prophecy from Thetis and the choice facing Achilles are not as central to the plot of the *Iliad* as they apparently were to the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)*; yet the *Iliad*, on this view, constantly evokes their significance in that earlier poetry. At *Il.* 9.410–16, for instance, Achilles' choice is between death at Troy with undying fame or a long life lived out at home without fame; this is not identical with the choice that we infer from the Summary for the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)*, but is close enough to recall it. Further details of Thetis' prophecy to Achilles are leaked out elliptically at 17.406–9, 18.8–11, 95–6, and 21.275–8. The first two allusions in the *Iliad* to the prophecy are typical of the *Iliad*'s playful manipulation of it. In book I, Achilles' short life is not conditional, but taken for granted as a *fact*: 352 (Achilleus to Thetis) 'since, mother, you bore me for a short life', 416–18 (Thetis to Achilleus) 'since your destiny is short, not at all long', 505–6 (Thetis to Zeus) 'honour my son, who *was born* the shortest-lived of everyone'. The short life of Achilles arguably has the status of 'fact' because the audience knows—through familiarity with an earlier version—which way Achilles is ultimately going to make up his mind. 'Destiny' here (416 αἶσα), therefore, would be synonymous with poetic tradition.¹⁴⁴ We should note, too, that Thetis' words at 417–18, 'now you are above all people short-lived (ὠκύμωρος)', presuppose as a foregone conclusion the choice that Achilles is actually going to make only after the death of Patroklos: 18.95 (Thetis to Achilles) 'you will be short-lived (ὠκύμωρος), child, in the light of what you say'; that is, in the light of Achilles' resolve, just made, to avenge Patroklos and kill Hektor.¹⁴⁵ The treatment of Thetis' prophecy in the *Iliad* makes good sense on the view that the *Iliad* is interacting with earlier poetry.¹⁴⁶

It has been argued that the *Iliad* cannot show familiarity with the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* at *Il.* 18.96, because, if Achilles' death is to follow 'immediately' after Hektor's, this leaves no scope for the arrival of Memnon, his killing of Antilochos, and his own death at Achilles' hands.¹⁴⁷ The argument is not

¹⁴² M. L. West 2003*b*: 10; cf. 2013: 145.

¹⁴³ Kullmann 1960: 387; Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 192–3.

¹⁴⁴ → Fate, as figure for tradition.

¹⁴⁵ See P. V. Jones 1996: 115.

¹⁴⁶ M. W. Edwards 1991: 158–9 suggests that a prophecy that the hero will die if a condition is fulfilled was a traditional motif.

¹⁴⁷ M. L. West 2003*b*: 7; cf. R. B. Rutherford 2013: 120–1. But see D. L. Cairns 2001: 43.

compelling. As the apparent Iliadic innovation of two sets of arms for Achilles (leaving no scope for the *Hoplōn krisis*) shows, the poet need not always have his eye on how a continuation of his song could be reconciled with tradition.¹⁴⁸ It is even conceivable that *Il.* 18.96 ‘quotes’ the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) (where Achilles’ death followed quickly on *Memnon*’s), while simultaneously negating the plot of that other poetry. This suggestion would have a parallel in $\Rightarrow$ *Il.* 16.444–7, which arguably both ‘quotes’ a scene in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) and simultaneously negates the possibility of its realization. In that case, we might see in *Il.* 18.96 another instance of playful interaction of the *Iliad* with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*).

In short, the traditional neoanalytical position seems fully viable: that the *Iliad* interacts with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) and not vice versa. The relationship between the two is then correct as given in Tables 2.3 and 2.4, and the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) rightly occupies the left-hand column as the earlier and $\rightarrow$ motivally prior version. The striking parallels between *Iliad* and **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) can be considered a way in which the *Iliad* ‘quotes’ the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*), on the level of narrative sequence, rather than of specific phrases or motifs.

We shall consider presently a well-known argument for quotation on the level of the specific phrase (*μέγας μεγαλωστί (κεῖτο)*). First, however, we should investigate the *Iliad*’s putative reception of a specific motif from the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*): the hero’s translation from the battlefield and his immortalization by his divine mother. This motif was employed twice in the *Aethiopsis*, at two climactic moments. First, the goddess Eos immortalized her son Memnon after he had been killed by Achilles: ‘and Eos gives him [Memnon] immortality, after begging for it from Zeus’ (Summary Bernabé pp. 68–9, ll. 14–15). Second, in a parallel scene, Thetis immortalized Achilles after his death: ‘and after that Thetis snatched up her son from the funeral pyre and conveyed him to the isle Leuke’ (Summary Bernabé p. 69, ll. 21–2). The latter scene may, like the former, have followed a supplication of Zeus by Thetis, if Pindar is indebted to the *Aethiopsis* at *O.* 2.79–80: ‘and his mother brought Achilles [to the Isle of the Blessed], after she had persuaded the heart of Zeus with her entreaties’.¹⁴⁹

The *Iliad* very probably plays with this motif. Achilles’ death and all that comes after it lie outside the action of the *Iliad*. But it is arguable that a scene of Thetis entreating Zeus for Achilles’ immortality from the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) is evoked at *Il.* 1.496–530.¹⁵⁰ (Compare *Il.* 1.502 *λίσσομένη* with

¹⁴⁸ See Appendix C.

¹⁴⁹ See Kirkwood 1982: 75. Pindar speaks, here, of the ‘Isle of the Blessed’, rather than Leuke; but cf. *N.* 4.49–50. Pindar and the *Aethiopsis*: Appendix D.

¹⁵⁰ Schoeck 1961: 59; cf. Slatkin 1991: 40; cf. 25–6.

Pindar O.2.80 λιταῖς, conceivably following the *Aethiopis*.)¹⁵¹ The object of Thetis' supplication in *Iliad* I is, however, emphatically not Achilles' immortality, as Achilles' early death is there taken for granted (505–6).¹⁵² And the scene in *Iliad* I is paralleled, with inversion, in *Iliad* XXIV. In the final book, Thetis does not, this time, seek out Zeus, but is summoned to him; the scene is no longer a private one (1.498, 541–2), but occurs in the presence of all the gods (24.98–102); and Thetis does not extort a favour from a reluctant Zeus, but instead is instructed by him (24.112). Throughout this part of book XXIV, the accent is on the imminent death of Achilles and the grief of the mother (84–6, 93–4, 104–5). The putative scene from the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) would be the object of an intertextual allusion in *Iliad* I and that scene in turn the object of a further intratextual allusion in *Iliad* XXIV, in each case powerfully inverted.¹⁵³

The scene between Eos and Zeus in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) is arguably evoked at *Il.* 16.431–61. Sarpedon, son of Zeus, is well placed to evoke Memnon, son of Eos.¹⁵⁴ In the *Aethiopis*, Eos apparently carried off Memnon's corpse from the battlefield and brought it to Ethiopia.¹⁵⁵ In the *Iliad*, Sarpedon's body is first removed from the battlefield by Apollo (*Il.* 16.678), then translated by Hypnos and Thanatos to Lycia (*Il.* 16.453–7, 671–5, 681–3).¹⁵⁶ The motif of the abduction and translation of a mortal by an immortal probably traditionally signified immortalization or heroization.¹⁵⁷ (It does not do so, save exceptionally, in the *Iliad*.)¹⁵⁸ This was certainly the

¹⁵¹ Willcock 1995: 160 suggests that Pindar may be influenced by the *Iliad*.

¹⁵² The bare fact of Achilles' death does not preclude his immortalization, as we can see from the *Aethiopis* (cf. Currie 2005: General Index s.v. 'death, precursor of immortality'); telling, rather, are the persistent references to his death coupled with the silence about any posthumous immortalization, a pattern replicated with the Dioskouroi, Sarpedon, and Herakles (*Il.* 3.243–4, ⇒ 16.457, 18.117–19). The *Odyssey*, placing Achilles' soul in the underworld (11.467–91, 539, 24.15–97), is sensitive to the *Iliad*'s conception.

¹⁵³ → Intratextuality and intertextuality.

¹⁵⁴ Fenik 1964: 30–1; Janko 1992: 313, 371; Burgess 2001: 218 n. 95; Scodel 2002: 27; Kullmann 2005: 21. Sceptical: Dihle 1970: 17–20. Quintus apparently acknowledges that the Iliadic Sarpedon recalls the Memnon of the *Aethiopis*: his narrative of the posthumous treatment of Memnon conflates the accounts of Sarpedon in the *Iliad* and Memnon in *Aethiopis*; cf. James 2004: 280 (on both Q.S. 2.553–5 and 650–1: see § 4.4, p. 123 n. 107).

¹⁵⁵ The episode is not in the Summary. But the *Aethiopis* is probably the source for the episode in the *Psychostasia* (or *Memnon*) of Aeschylus (or Euphorion: M. L. West 2000a: 345–6): *TrGF* iii.375. It is probably likewise the source of iconography (vases, mirrors, etc.) showing Eos carrying off a lifeless Memnon: *LIMC* III.i.783–7, VI.i.456–8, 460–1. Janko 1992: 372.

¹⁵⁶ Glaukos' translation to Lycia at Q.S. 4.1–12 combines features of the Iliadic Sarpedon and Memnon (Q.S. 2.585–92): James 2004: 289.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Hes. *Th.* 987–91; *Il.* 2.549–51; *Cypria* Summary Bernabé p. 41, ll. 47–8 and 'Hes.' *Cat.* fr. 23a.17–26M–W; *Haph* 202–6. Rohde 1925: i.68–90; Strecker 1962: 465–70; Larson 2001: 66–70.

¹⁵⁸ In the *Iliad*, Trojan heroes are frequently snatched out of danger by gods (3.380–2, 5.23, 5.311–18, 20.291–340, 20.443–4, 21.597, etc.; Marks 2010), always a temporary rescue from an immediate death. This has been seen as a type-scene (Fenik 1968: 12, 36–7; Hainsworth 1969: 30). Rather, we might recognize a bold and recurrent Iliadic transformation of an inherited

signification of Eos' abduction and translation of Memnon in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*): her grant of immortality to him will have followed (Summary Bernabé pp. 68–9, ll. 14–15). The *Iliad* has retained the motif of divine abduction and translation for Sarpedon, yet it insists on a purely routine burial for him: 16.457 = 675 'for that is the honour of the dead.' (Virgil's imitation brings out the crucial point, implicit in Homer: *qui solus honos Acheronte sub imo est*, 'for that is the *only* honour beneath deepest Acheron', *Aen.* 11.23.)¹⁵⁹ There is no suggestion here that Sarpedon is anything more than ordinarily dead.¹⁶⁰ It is hard even to guess, beyond the shared motif of abduction and translation, how closely the scene with Sarpedon in the *Iliad* may have 'quoted' a scene with Memnon in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*). It is possible that Eos in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) bathed Memnon's corpse, as Apollo bathes Sarpedon's (*Il.* 16.667, 679).¹⁶¹ Perhaps Hypnos and Thanatos assisted at Eos' removal of Memnon's corpse, as they do at Apollo's removal of Sarpedon's.¹⁶² The duo of Hypnos and Thanatos suggests the reversibility of the hero's condition, the possible conversion of his death into a sleep, heroization, perhaps.¹⁶³ Such a motif would suit the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*), where Memnon was indeed made immortal. In the *Iliad*, by contrast, Hypnos and Thanatos would have been relegated to non-functional, if honorific, pall-bearers. (Compare, perhaps, the Iliadic transformation of divinely made weapons into aesthetic, non-functional artefacts, discussed previously.)¹⁶⁴ In the *Iliad*, finally, Sarpedon's interment includes anointment with ἀμβροσίη and dressing in ἄμβροτα εἴματα (*Il.* 16.670 = 680), both suggestive of immortalization.¹⁶⁵ It is conceivable that both featured in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*)

motif, whereby translation by a god entailed a permanent exemption from death (Kullmann 1956: 125–31; 1960: 268). Aineias' reference to Ganymedes' translation to Olympus at *Il.* 20.234–5 (cf. *HApH* 202–6), will be an instance of → character-text being used to point up the difference between an Iliadic and a traditional conception.

¹⁵⁹ The Homeric phrase is probably formulaic: cf. *Od.* 24.296 and (with ὄ for τὸ) *Il.* 23.9, *Od.* 24.190.

¹⁶⁰ Forbes Irving 1990: 10. The verb *παρχύσσει* (*Il.* 16.456, 674) is sometimes etymologized as 'heroize', 'deify': see Chantraine 1968–80: 1095; Nagy 1990b: 131–3, 138–9; 2012: 61–9; cf. Bachvarova 2016: 446; differently, Janko 1992: 377; Janda 1996; Langholf 2006: 323. If that was the original meaning, it has been reinterpreted in the *Iliad* to mean just 'bury': *Il.* 7.85; cf. Hsch. τ 229.

¹⁶¹ Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 160, 165; Janko 1992: 313, 395.

¹⁶² Hypnos and Thanatos in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*): Kullmann 1960: 34, 319; Clark and Coulson 1978: 71–3; Weiss 1986: esp. 780, 783, nos 320, 321; Janko 1992: 313, 395. Differently, Kossatz-Deissmann 1992: 448–9, 456, 456–7 on no. 69, 460–1; Simon 1992: 238, 240.

¹⁶³ Pestalozzi 1945: 13–14; Kullmann 1960: 34; Albinus 2000: 92. Differently, Rohde 1925: i.86 n. 1; Hölscher 1955: 393. Death as 'sleep': Lattimore 1962: 78, 82, 164–5, 307.

¹⁶⁴ Another instance, therefore, where a traditional motif would have become 'defactualized' ('enttatsächlich'): Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 196). → Loss of function.

¹⁶⁵ Ambrosia and immortality: Watkins 1995: 391–7; Pulleyn 2006: 61–7; M. L. West 2007: 157–8 esp. 157 n. 126. Cf., e.g., *HDem* 237; Pind. O.1.62–3, P.9.63, and see N. J. Richardson 1974: 238–9. In Homer, the uses of ambrosia are more liberal: *Il.* 19.38 (Thetis with the dead Patroklos); 19.347, 353 (Athene with the living Achilleus); 23.186–7 (Aphrodite anoints the

in connection with Eos' 'giving immortality' (Summary Bernabé p. 69, l. 15) to Memnon. The state of our knowledge of the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* is too incomplete to make this argument more than hypothetical; the argument runs parallel, of course, with the previous suggestion that the Homeric poems may 'quote' earlier poetry in some detail. On this hypothesis, we would have here again a narrative inconsistency: the *Iliad* would insist that Sarpedon is not immortalized or heroized, unlike Memnon in the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)*; but it would retain details evocative of that immortalization, transferred to a different hero and given a quite different signification. Again, we should not assume that the *Iliad* poet was simply caught between two versions: vestiges of the version of the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* in the *Iliad* serve to highlight the differences in poetic treatment. The Iliadic incapacity, or disinclination, of a divine parent to save their offspring is generalized into a principle in that poem (15.138–41, 16.521–2, 18.117–19, 21.109–10).

The conference between Zeus and Hera on Sarpedon's fate also deserves attention (*Il.* 16.431–61). Zeus' dilemma here dramatizes the poet's choice.¹⁶⁶ (Compare the role frequently claimed for Athene in the *Odyssey*.) The question whether the *Iliad* is to immortalize its 'Memnon' is thus insistently raised: the references to 'fate' (16.433 μοῖρ', 441 αἴσῃ) suggest that the *Iliad* poet is self-consciously shaping up to the poetic tradition. It is then all the more striking that the *Iliad* poet flies in the face of what the audience must expect for a Memnon-surrogate; the poet seems to pass off a bold innovation as what, in his version, 'must be'.¹⁶⁷

There is a possibility that the *Iliad* explicitly acknowledges ('signals') its interaction with the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* at 16.444–7:

- ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν·
 445 αἶ κε ζῶν πέμψῃς Σαρπηδόνα ὅνδε δόμονδ' εἰς,
 φράζεο μὴ τις ἔπειτα θεῶν ἐθέλῃσι καὶ ἄλλος
 πέμπειν ὃν φίλον υἷον ἀπὸ κρατερῆς ὕσμίνης·

And I will tell you something else: you lay it in your heart.
 If you send Sarpedon alive to his home,
 take care that no one else of the gods may want hereafter
 to send their own son from the mighty battle.

dead Hektor ἐλαίῳ ἀμβροσίῳ); cf. *Od.* 4.445, 18.193. 'Immortal clothes' and immortality: Janko 1992: 396; Thieme 1952, esp. 22. See *Od.* 7.259–60, 265 (Kalypso with Odysseus; she aimed to make him immortal: 5.136, 5.209, 7.256–7, 23.336); 24.59 (Nereids with the dead Achilles).

¹⁶⁶ R. B. Rutherford 2013: 51. → Gods, as figure for tradition.

¹⁶⁷ Schmitz 1994: 11 (on 'die Szenen in der Ilias..., in denen Zeus für kurze Zeit überlegt, gegen die μοῖρα zu handeln'): 'In ihnen stellt, in einer Art "mise en abîme", der Dichter gewissermaßen sich selbst dar bei der Wahl, der Tradition (dem Schicksal) zu folgen oder gegen sie zu verstoßen.' Cf. J. V. Morrison 1997: 283–5; S. Richardson 1990: 193–5.

Hera alarms Zeus with talk of setting a precedent. In literary terms, though, this is a *hysteron proteron*.¹⁶⁸ The Iliadic scene looks forward to Zeus' discomfiture when Eos (and Thetis) will petition for the immortality of their sons. For an audience familiar with the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*, line 446, 'take care that no one else (*καὶ ἄλλος*) of the gods may want hereafter to send their own son from the mighty battle', cannot fail to bring to mind Eos (and Thetis) in the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*.¹⁶⁹ The phrase *καὶ ἄλλος* is rich in allusive suggestion.¹⁷⁰ What is already known to the audience as a literary 'fact' from the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* seems to be presented by the Iliadic Hera as a future possibility (*ἐπειτα*, 'hereafter'), and one to be prevented. The interaction with the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* is playful: the earlier poetry would be simultaneously evoked and negated. There is also inversion: Zeus now is the parent concerned for his son and it is the goddess who must be prevailed on, with, crucially, the opposite outcome for the mortal son.¹⁷¹ (We saw such reversals with *Odyssey* VI–VII and *Iliad* XXIV.)

An intriguing sidelight is thrown on this by Virgil's transferral of this same motif to Hercules and Jupiter contemplating the fate of Pallas at *Aen.* 10.464–73.¹⁷² I have argued that the *Iliad* poet acknowledges in *καὶ ἄλλος* the poetic context from which the motif has been transferred. Virgil, in turn, explicitly acknowledges his (Iliadic) source by making Jupiter refer to Sarpedon (*Aen.* 10.469–71):

... Troiae sub moenibus altis
tot gnati cecidere deum, quin occidit una
Sarpedon, mea progenies...

... beneath the high walls of Troy
fell many sons of gods; indeed, there fell along with them
Sarpedon, my son...

¹⁶⁸ ⇒ *Od.* 24.76–9, implying that Antilochos became Achilles' dearest friend only after Patroklos' death, may be another such *hysteron proteron*. Such *hysteron proteron* is typical of 'secondary' epic. Cf. A.R. 4.1028 (Medeia is prior to Nausikaa in terms of the fabula, posterior in terms of their literary relationship: cf. Hunter 1993b: xxiv–xxv). Cf. Pind. O.1.43–5 (Zeus–Ganymedes is Pindar's literary model for Poseidon–Pelops). The Akkadian epic *Enuma elish*, though secondary to *Anzu*, sets its action at the beginning of the universe (Machinist 2005: 42, 45–6).

¹⁶⁹ Schoeck 1961: 25. Cf. Eustath. on *Il.* 16.432 = iii.1069.23–9 van der Valk 'Hera complains... saying in a way that not even Achilles will die in the future, as he is the son of an immortal mother, Thetis.'

¹⁷⁰ *καὶ* linking the fate of a character to his 'allusive doublet': *Il.* 23.80 (Burgess 2001: 74); *Od.* 11.618 (Danek 1998a: 247–9). Cf. ⇒ Eur. *Phoen.* 854. → Words of iteration.

¹⁷¹ → Opposition in imitation.

¹⁷² On the two passages, cf. Barchiesi 1984: 16–30 = 2015: 6–15.

Here, too, we have a transferred motif with inversion: Jupiter here plays rather the part of Hera (compare *Il.* 16.458–9) than of his Homeric counterpart, Zeus. The realignment brings us closer to the *Aethiopsis* (Jupiter is on the receiving end of a supplication made by another divinity); but the outcome of the supplication is the same for Pallas as for Sarpedon in the *Iliad*, and pointedly in contrast with that for Memnon in the *Aethiopsis*. Another inversion is that, instead of Hera's fear of setting a precedent, Virgil's Jupiter stresses the necessity of following one. The *Aeneid*, moreover, seems here to subscribe to the Iliadic rule that gods do not save their sons. Yet this is undercut by being addressed by Jupiter to Hercules, a son who has been deified in the *Aeneid* (compare also 8.301 *decus addite diuis*); undercut too because the apotheosis of a son of Venus, and of a much more distant progeny, hangs over the whole poem (Aeneas: 1.259–60; cf. 12.794–5; Julius/Augustus Caesar: 1.286–9).

I have thought the Virgilian passage worth dwelling on because the *Aeneid* offers an invaluable extant poetic commentary on the relationship of Homer and the Epic Cycle.¹⁷³ In his reception of the *Iliad* (and *Aethiopsis*) in *Aeneid* X, Virgil is arguably doing something remarkably similar to the *Iliad* poet in his reception of the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*). This is not an isolated phenomenon.¹⁷⁴ There may be two ways of making sense of this.

One possibility is to suppose that Virgil discovered the techniques in Homer and learned them from him: namely, 'quotation' (non-verbatim) with inversion, explicit acknowledgement of the model, and the gods as representatives of the poet's will.¹⁷⁵ In that case, Virgil turns out to be an unexpectedly useful guide on how to read Homer. At least three subsidiary questions would then arise. First, had Virgil read the *Aethiopsis* in a non-epitomized form?¹⁷⁶ Second, is *Aen.* 10.464–73 a 'contamination' of the *Iliad* with the *Aethiopsis* (as, for

¹⁷³ Compare, in general, N. J. Richardson 1993: 43; Hardie 1998: 55, on the need 'to read the *Aeneid* as a commentary on the Homeric poems'.

¹⁷⁴ In *Aeneid* IX, the Trojans' defence of their camp/city involves transference and → 'contamination' of Iliadic material: the Achaean defence of the wall around the ships, and the Trojan defence of their own city wall (Hardie 1994: 10–11). Yet already in the *Iliad* the Achaeans' defence of their seven-gated wall around the ships may involve transference from pre-Iliadic Theban epic poetry, where the Thebans defended their seven-gated city wall (Singor 1992: 404). Again we may wonder to what extent the Virgilian reception of Homer can and should be considered sensitive and responsive to Homer's reception of his own models.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Dekel 2012: 2: 'Virgil bases his own active interpretation and adaptation of Homer on the interaction between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* themselves.'

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Fraenkel 1932: 247–8; cf. 242; Kopff 1981: esp. 920–1; Burgess 2001: 45; cf. M. L. West 2013: 48. Sceptical: Heinze 1993: 159; Horsfall 1979: 46–7; 2003: 466, 468; 2008: xx; Scafolgio 2004a: 44; Gärtner 2015. In general: Fantuzzi 2014: 438. On Virgil's self-conscious relationship with the Epic Cycle (esp. *Aen.* 1.456–7), cf. Barchiesi 1994: 117–18 = 1999: 333–4. → Virgil and Epic Cycle.

instance, *Aen.* 8.382–4 seems to be)?¹⁷⁷ Third, did Virgil, as a reader of both the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis*, take Homer to be engaged in a reception of the Cyclical poem (as modern neanalytical scholars have assumed) and not vice versa, the Cyclical poets responding to Homer?¹⁷⁸ This possibility is raised by the reading proposed of *Aen.* 10.464–73. But it seems to run counter to other considerations.¹⁷⁹ In particular, one scruples to ascribe the technique of quotation with inversion, so fundamental and pervasive a feature of Virgilian imitation, to Virgil's observation specifically of how Homer engaged his epic predecessors.¹⁸⁰

An alternative would be to suppose that Homer and Virgil each interacted with earlier poetry in surprisingly similar ways, but independently of one another. The technique of the oral poet would then turn out to be unexpectedly close to that of the literary poet.¹⁸¹ That would give us a startling rapprochement between an oral and a literary poetics, and would problematize any categorization of Homeric epic as straightforwardly primary, Virgilian as secondary.¹⁸²

A further significant feature of the interaction of the *Iliad* with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) is the many-to-one and one-to-many correspondence between the two.¹⁸³ The Iliadic Patroklos has, according to the argument of this chapter, a prototype in both Antilochos and Achilles in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*). Conversely, Memnon in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) is reflected in both Hektor and Sarpedon in the *Iliad*, Antilochos in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) in both Antilochos and Patroklos in the *Iliad*.¹⁸⁴ We have observed

¹⁷⁷ On 'contamination', see Hinds 1998: 141–2; cf. Pasquali 1951 (1942): 15, 17; cf. 18; F. Cairns 1979: 121; R. F. Thomas 1986: 193–8 ('conflation', 'multiple reference'). On *Aen.* 8.382–4, see Kopff 1981: 932, 935; differently, M. L. West 2003b: 9 n. 42.

¹⁷⁸ → Virgil, as reader of Homer.

¹⁷⁹ Aristarchan-influenced Alexandrian scholarship insisted that the poets of the Cycle were 'later' than Homer (Severyns 1928: 99–100); Virgil was steeped in Alexandrian scholarship: (Schlunk 1974; Schmit-Neuerberg 1999). The ancient, and Virgilian, view of Homer as 'Ocean' apparently presupposes that Homer was the wellspring of all other poets (F. Williams 1978: 88–9, 98–9; Morgan 1999: 32–9). But that view was not universal in antiquity; e.g. the 'Mythographus Homericus' recognized that Homer had his 'sources', sometimes reflected in Cyclical epics (⇒ Σ D Il. 1.5).

¹⁸⁰ On Virgilian → opposition in imitation, see R. F. Thomas 1986: 185–9 (using the terms 'correction' and 'window reference'); Hardie 1993: 118; cf. 1986: 158–67, 233–6; 1998: 8, 31, 44, 51, 88; Farrell 1991: 207–72.

¹⁸¹ Cf. D. P. Fowler 1997: 31 = 2000: 134.

¹⁸² Cf. Feeney 1998: 57–60. The *Odyssey* has, of course, long been regarded as secondary to the *Iliad* (e.g. R. B. Rutherford 2013: 76–81).

¹⁸³ J. T. Kakridis 1949: 60–1; Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 191–2; Lohmann 1970: 193. Cf. Loudon 2006: 2–3, 317; Tsagalis 2011: 223. → Multiple correspondence.

¹⁸⁴ Sarpedon and Hektor are intratextually associated in the *Iliad* (16.431–61 ~ 22.166–87), as are Patroklos and Antilochos (⇒ 16.1–3 ~ 18.1–2, 17).

multiple correspondence in the *Odyssey's* allusion to the *Iliad*.¹⁸⁵ J. S. Burgess considered this feature 'confusing' to the audience.¹⁸⁶ He objects to an interpretation that makes 'one Iliadic character reflect two non-Homeric characters at one and the same time', as being 'too polysemic'.¹⁸⁷ This same polysemic state of affairs has been embraced by some neoanalytical scholars.¹⁸⁸ But what is perhaps especially noteworthy is how closely it again recalls the practice of Virgil, a literate poet with a reading public.¹⁸⁹ Here we have another striking common ground between an oral and a literary poetics.¹⁹⁰ The many-to-one and one-to-many correspondence between characters and their prototypes argues a sophisticated, and self-reflective, interaction with earlier poetry in the early epic tradition. I see no strong a priori reasons to deny the 'performance culture' of the archaic age this 'Virgilian' type of 'allusive intertextuality', or to suspect such allusive intertextuality of being an 'anachronistic retrojection of literate poetics into the *Iliad*'.¹⁹¹ This kind of 'one-to-many' intertextual situation is found in the fifth-century 'performance culture' of Athenian tragedy. Sophocles' Aias reflects not only his Iliadic (and Odyssean) namesake, but also the Iliadic Hektor.¹⁹² The same playwright's Philoktetes reflects simultaneously Achilles, Odysseus, and Polyphemos.¹⁹³ The suspicion of anachronism may perhaps be allayed by pointing to the developed and densely allusive intertextuality arguably found in the Standard Babylonian *Gilgamesh* epic of the second millennium BC.¹⁹⁴

The *Iliad's* interaction with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) is a crucial part of the meaning of the former poem, just as the *Odyssey's* interaction with the *Iliad* is a crucial part of its meaning.¹⁹⁵ We may assume a 'competitive' relationship of the *Iliad* with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*), as of the *Odyssey*

¹⁸⁵ We have seen (§ 2.1) at the beginning of the *Odyssey* Odysseus simultaneously (i.e. within the same span of narrative) evoking both the Iliadic Priamos (the suppliant) and the Iliadic Hektor (the 'dead' person on whose account the supplication is being made). He also simultaneously evokes both the Iliadic Achilles (in his deeply felt absence from the sphere of action, and in his choice of lives: cf. R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 133–5; 2013: 77) and the Iliadic Hektor (in the need for the really or symbolically dead hero to be returned to his family). Likewise Penelope, prematurely lamenting (see Chapter 4), evokes both Thetis, the Iliadic female closest to Achilles (⇒ *Od.* 19.257–8 ~ *Il.* 18.59–60, 440–1), and Andromache, the Iliadic female closest to Hektor (⇒ *Od.* 1.356–9, 21.350–3 ~ *Il.* 6.490–3).

¹⁸⁶ Burgess 1997: 15; cf. 2005b: 124; 2009: 79. ¹⁸⁷ Burgess 2009: 79.

¹⁸⁸ See Heubeck 1950: 34–5; Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 194–5.

¹⁸⁹ On Virgil's practice, see Hardie 1998: 8 (on *Eclogues* and Theocritus); J. Griffin 1985: 193–7 (on *Aeneid* and Homer). In general, Homeric poetics compared to Virgilian: M. W. Edwards 1987b: 60; Dowden 1996: 49 n. 14, 58 and n. 62; Janko 1998: 9–10.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Dowden 1996: 49.

¹⁹¹ Quotations from Burgess 2009: 79–80. Cf. Kelly 2015: 34.

¹⁹² Garner 1990: 51–64; Hesk 2003: 24–34. ¹⁹³ Schein 2013: 15–18.

¹⁹⁴ See §§ 1.5 and 5.19.

¹⁹⁵ Interpretative significance is effectively denied by Schoeck 1961: 25–6, 30. See Burgess 2001: 218 n. 92 on the different neoanalytical interpretations of correspondences between the *Iliad* and the **Memnonis*.

with the *Iliad*, a 'conscious rivalry' or 'creative mimesis'.¹⁹⁶ This kind of competition may, of course, be respectful; it may even be complimentary to the model, as with the *Odyssey*'s 'rivalry' with the *Iliad*, and Virgil's *imitatio* of Homer. This kind of competitive relationship need not even rule out joint authorship of the *Iliad* and the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*), as the relationship of the *Odyssey* with the *Iliad* need not rule out joint authorship of those poems. The provocatively different world view taken by the *Iliad* vis-à-vis the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) (Iliadic gods and goddesses do not save their sons, divinely made armour does not in the *Iliad* render the wearer invincible, Iliadic transportation from battle and anointing with ambrosia does not entail immortalization) should be seen (like the contrasting heroism and theodicy of the *Odyssey* vis-à-vis the *Iliad*) as a poetic response, not the personal expression of a poet's world view.¹⁹⁷

Another important point emerges from the comparison between the *Iliad*'s interaction with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) and the *Odyssey*'s interaction with the *Iliad*. It is striking that the *Iliad* does not overlap in content with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) and never mentions Memnon, despite frequent prophecies of Achilles' death. The *Odyssey* likewise does not overlap in content with the *Iliad*, despite frequent analepses of the Trojan war ('Monro's law').¹⁹⁸ D. L. Page used the latter observation fifty years ago to argue that the *Odyssey* poet was wholly ignorant of the *Iliad*.¹⁹⁹ M. L. West has invoked the former to argue that the *Iliad* poet was ignorant of the **Memnonis*.²⁰⁰ Alternatively, the avoidance of overlap may in both cases be seen as itself a form of allusion, a way of making reference by refusing reference.²⁰¹ That conclusion seems inevitable if we accept the evidence otherwise for interaction between the two poems.

Nothing has been said so far about verbatim quotations of the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) in the *Iliad*, of which a number have been proposed.²⁰² Of these

¹⁹⁶ Heubeck 1954: 100 and 1988: 13, after Jacoby 1961: 109 'schöpferische Imitation'; cf. Usener 1990: 205.

¹⁹⁷ Differently, Heubeck 1954: 100; 1988: 21–3. Cf. Cook 1995: 43.

¹⁹⁸ Monro 1901: 325 (citing in turn Niese!). Passing references to the death of Patroklos at *Od.* 3.110 and 24.79 (M. L. West 2014: 25) leave the point unaffected. The contrast with the *Odyssey*'s various overlaps in content with the Cyclical epics is striking; M. L. West *ibid.* 28–30.

¹⁹⁹ Page 1955: 159: 'the reason why the *Iliad* is ignored by the Odyssean poet is simply that the *Iliad* was unknown to him'.

²⁰⁰ M. L. West 2003b: 6–7: 'The *Iliad* contains not the slightest hint that the story of Achilles will involve such a person [sc. Memnon], or that such a person exists... The conclusion is plain and unavoidable. The *Iliad* poet... did not know the Memnon episode.'

²⁰¹ Pointed exclusion of material in some sense expected by the audience as a form of allusion: Dowden 1996: 53; D. L. Cairns 2001: 36–7; Finkelberg 2015: 135. Sceptical: Andersen 2012: 146–7, 148. With *Odyssey* and *Iliad*: Usener 1990: 205; Ford 1992: 158; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 120–1; Danek 1998a: 27.

²⁰² Cf. Pestalozzi 1945: 20 (on *Il.* 17.289–90); J. T. Kakridis 1949: 84 (on *Il.* 23.13–14).

the most suggestive is the idea that the striking (non-formular?) phrase μέγας μεγαλωστί (κεῖτο) was used to describe the prostrate corpse of Achilles in the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* and taken up from there at *Il.* 18.26 (of Patroklos' death, transferred from Achilles' death in the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)*) and *Od.* 24.40 (in the context of an account of Achilles' own death, apparently following the version of the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)*).²⁰³ In passing I mention an intriguing fact: the epithet χαλκοκορυστής is used only of Memnon, Hektor, and Sarpedon in extant hexameter verse.²⁰⁴ It is at least thinkable that it has been transferred from the Ethiopian hero, whose divinely made armour was so important, to his two Iliadic surrogates.²⁰⁵

This section has argued for the viability of a model on which the *Iliad* engages not just with mythological content, but with the specific form given to that content in epic poetry: extended narrative sequences, detailed individual motifs, and perhaps detailed phraseology. This model implies interaction with a 'poem' rather than a 'song-tradition', or if a 'song-tradition', then one so stable in its details that the difference between it and a 'poem' seems to become nebulous.²⁰⁶ The model is merely proposed, not, of course, proven.

2.4 Conclusion

The Homeric poems clearly aspire to be new songs.²⁰⁷ Familiar episodes are transferred to novel settings: Priamos' supplication of Achilles is transferred in the *Odyssey* to Odysseus' supplication of Arete; Achilles' killing of Memnon is transferred in the *Iliad* to Patroklos killing Sarpedon and to Achilles

²⁰³ Cf. Q.S. 3.419 κεῖτο μέγας; Hor. *Carm.* 4.6.11 *procidit late*. See Pestalozzi 1945: 18; J. T. Kakridis 1949: 84–5; Kullmann 1960: 38–9; Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 168; Dowden 1996: 59 and n. 63; Willcock 1997: 177; Danek 1998a: 468–9 and 2002: 17; M. L. West 2011a: 326 and 2013: 152; Burgess 2012a: 171–6. Differently, Usener 1990: 104–8, arguing that *Od.* 24.40 quotes the *Iliad*, and that *Il.* 16.776 is the original context. Apropos of *Il.* 16.776 = *Od.* 24.40 λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων, it is a question whether 'horsemanship was appropriate for Achilles' (Burgess 2012a: 173). An affirmative answer is suggested by Alcae. fr. 42.14 Voigt (sc. Ἀχιλλῆα) ξάνθαν ἐλάττη[ρα πώλων] (Alcaeus and epic tradition: M. L. West 2002: 213–19 = 2011b: 399–407). On the relationship of *Il.* 16.775–6 (of Kebriones), 18.26–7, *Od.* 24.39–40 (both of Achilles), see Fenik 1968: 213; Janko 1992: 408; Burgess 2012a: 172–6; differently Dihle 1970: 22–4; Cantilena 2012a: 84.

²⁰⁴ Hes. *Th.* 984 Μέμνονα χαλκοκορυστήν | *Il.* 15.221 Ἔκτορα χαλκοκορυστήν | (cf. *Il.* 16.536, 16.654), *Il.* 5.699 Ἔκτορι χαλκοκορυστή | (cf. *Il.* 6.398, 13.720, 15.458, 16.358). *Il.* 6.199 Σαρπηδόνα χαλκοκορυστήν |. The occurrence of χαλκοκορυστά with Ares (vocative, not in a name-epithet combination) at *HHom* 8.2 may be discounted; the hymn is very late.

²⁰⁵ Mühlestein 1986: 217 = 1987: 182. One might entertain the same for περίφρων Εὐρύκλεια (*Od.* 19.357, 491, 20.134, 21.381) alongside περίφρων Πηνελόπεια (x 41 *Od.*). Cf. Whallon 2000: 334–5.

²⁰⁶ Cf. § 3.8, pp. 102–3. → Poem versus song-tradition.

²⁰⁷ For the importance attached to 'new songs' in the early epic tradition, cf. 'Hes.' fr. 357.2 M-W.

killing Hektor. Plots are changed in their essential elements: the recognition of Odysseus by Penelope is transposed in the *Odyssey* to come after the killing of the suitors. The traditional signification of scenes is radically altered: Penelope's conversation with Odysseus and his foot-washing in the *Odyssey* do not entail Penelope's complicity in the killing of the suitors; nor do Sarpedon's translation, washing, and interment in the *Iliad* entail his immortalization. The premium placed on innovation in the early epic tradition is suggested by Telemachos' statement that 'men celebrate that song more which echoes freshest in the ears of the listeners' (*Od.* 1.351–2).²⁰⁸

The Homeric poems certainly offer support for this picture of restless innovation. The *Iliad*, I have argued, interacts with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) in transferring the pivotal role of Antilochos (the friend whose death Achilles will die to avenge) to Patroklos.²⁰⁹ But the *Iliad* seems to show a further stage of innovation. It can be argued that the *Iliad* has transferred the (traditional?) role of Patroklos to Phoinix, who thus becomes a surrogate for Patroklos even while Patroklos is himself a surrogate for Antilochos. There is little prospect of a consensus ever being reached over the problems of the Embassy of *Iliad* IX; in what follows I simply present, with skeletal argumentation, a suggestion that is consonant with the arguments of this chapter.²¹⁰

Many scholars accept that the *Iliad* interacts with an earlier version of an Embassy to Achilles. It may do so in a way comparable to that in which I have argued the *Odyssey* interacts with an earlier poem on Odysseus' homecoming. Several have supposed that in an earlier version of the Embassy, Odysseus and Aias went as sole ambassadors to Achilles.²¹¹ We might suppose that in such a version Patroklos, from within Achilles' tent, added his voice to theirs and finally prevailed on Achilles to let him go into battle in his armour. In the *Iliad*'s Embassy, no such contribution of Patroklos occurs, the embassy fails, and we wait five books (six, with the *Doloneia*) for Patroklos' pivotal intervention.²¹² (Similarly in the *Odyssey*, the anticipated recognition

²⁰⁸ Telemachos presumably intends a song that is newly composed (cf. Plat. *Resp.* 424c1 ἄσματα νέα), rather than to one which is of recent subject matter (a song of recent subject matter will necessarily be of recent composition, but the converse does not hold): so Danek 1998a: 60; Scodel 2002: 53–4; differently, Krischer 1990: 53; Schwabl 1990: 72; M. L. West 1999: 365 n. 3 = 2011b: 410 n. 3; D'Angour 2011: 184–9. Epic audiences do not generally prefer recent subject matter (e.g. *Il.* 9.189, Hes. *Th.* 100). The *Odyssey*'s preoccupation with 'new song': H. Mackie 1997: 79–82 esp. 82 n. 13.

²⁰⁹ Neoanalytical scholars have wondered whether Patroklos is an invention of the *Iliad* poet; see, sceptically, Janko 1992: 313–14; Burgess 2001: 71–3.

²¹⁰ Brief and balanced discussions of the problems of the Embassy: J. Griffin 1995: 51–3; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 108–10; Scodel 2002: 160–71.

²¹¹ e.g. M. L. West 2011a: 218.

²¹² For the failed embassy to Achilles as a likely innovation of the *Iliad* poet, cf. J. Griffin 1995: 21. The Achaeans' surprise at the failure of the embassy (*Il.* 9.693–6; cf. 430–3) may

between Odysseus and Penelope does not occur in book XIX, but is put off for three books.) The *Iliad* implies in a couple of places after book IX that an embassy to Achilles has yet to take place (11.608–10, 16.72).²¹³ This may perhaps be construed as another instance of narrative inconsistency, by which the *Iliad* recalls the earlier version from which it is departing. It is possible to take a similar view of the most famous of all Homeric narrative inconsistencies, the duals of *Il.* 9.182–98, as reminding the audience that in an earlier version two ambassadors, not three, went to Achilles from Agamemnon.²¹⁴ (That does not entail that the text does not work satisfactorily on its own terms.)²¹⁵ Phoinix himself is an untraditional-seeming figure.²¹⁶ His life story resembles Patroklos' in important respects; and he and Patroklos are also linked by the tears they shed in concern for the Achaean ships (9.433, 16.3), as we have seen Patroklos and Antilochos are linked by their tears (16.3, 18.17; see §§ 4.5, 4.8).²¹⁷ Phoinix is an anomalous and unexplained presence in Agamemnon's train rather than in Achilles' tent (9.168: compare 617–22).²¹⁸ With his anomalous and unmotivated presence at the meeting of the Achaean leaders, away from Achilles' tent (to which attention is drawn at 9.611–19), and Nestor's singling out of Phoinix as an important player in the embassy (9.168), we may compare and contrast the well-motivated absence of Patroklos from Achilles' tent and Nestor's singling out of Patroklos as an important mediator with Achilles (11.599–617, 765–805). It is possible to think that the role formerly played by Patroklos has been transferred to Achilles' old tutor.²¹⁹ (Similarly, in *Odyssey* XIX the recognition of Odysseus by Penelope is transferred to the old nurse Eurykleia, a comparable figure to the old retainer Phoinix.) In *Iliad* IX, Phoinix tells a story of Meleagros in which the hero's wife is called (novelly, it seems) 'Kleopatra': both her name and her role in the

perhaps be taken as a figure the audience's surprise; for a comparable argument on *Il.* 21.49–59, see Kullmann 1960: 295, 296–7.

²¹³ Motzkus 1964 122–33.

²¹⁴ Cf. Hainsworth 1993: 87: 'an undigested fragment of an earlier or alternative embassy'; Motzkus 1964: 103–4; Goold 1977: 10–11; D. L. Cairns 2001a: 36; M. L. West 2011a: 218–19. Compare Scodel 2002: 162–3, point '2' (called a 'Neanalytic' approach to the problem of the duals).

²¹⁵ Cf. J. Griffin 1995: 25; Scodel 2002: 170–1. The otherwise attractive (cf. Nordheider 2012: 183) theory of Aristarchus (*ΣΣ A Il* 9.197, 502; cf. 168, 169, 182) that Phoinix was not (perceived by Achilles as) a member of the embassy founders on *Il.* 9.421–9 (for other objections, see J. Griffin 1995: 51; Scodel 2002: 166).

²¹⁶ Cheiron as Achilles' teacher seems more traditional: Braswell 1971: 22–3; C. J. Mackie 1997: 2–3, 9; cf. J. Griffin 1977: 41; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 109. Phoinix himself is unlikely to be an Iliadic invention: S. R. West 2001: 4, 10–11; Kullmann 1960: 133; Burgess 2001: 85–6; differently, von Scheliha 1943: 222–32; Erbse 1993: 387. He featured in the *Cypria*: fr. 19, 21 Bernabé.

²¹⁷ Phoinix and Patroklos: Nordheider 2010: 980.6–38; 2012: 187–8.

²¹⁸ Motzkus 1964: 111–15; J. Griffin 1995: 127; M. L. West 2011a: 218–19. *Σ* bT *Il.* 9.168b attempts to account for Phoinix's absence from Achilles' tent.

²¹⁹ Cf. M. W. Edwards 1987a: 228.

embedded story of persuading the hero to return to the battle evoke Patroklos in the primary narrative.²²⁰ This secondary narrative of Phoinix, foreshadowing, albeit imprecisely, the plot of the poem, may be compared with Helene's secondary narrative at $\Rightarrow$ *Od.* 4.240–64. Or compare again the narrative sequence in *Odyssey* XIX: in *Iliad* IX, a putatively traditional plot line (whereby Patroklos intervenes with Achilleus) is displaced by a novel alternative (Phoinix intervenes with Achilleus, but in vain); but the displaced traditional plot line is hinted at in a remote narrative mode: Phoinix's embedded narration of Kleopatra's (successful) intervention with Meleagros. Similarly, in *Odyssey* XIX, Penelope's second-order recognition of clothes—described, but not seen, in 'Aithon's' embedded tale—may hint at Penelope's real recognition of Odysseus in the displaced plot line.

This reconstruction, like the others, is avowedly speculative. The reconstruction would entail that the *Iliad* interacts not just with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*), but with another, intervening, earlier poem in which Patroklos interceded with Achilleus during the Embassy, which already interacted with the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*).²²¹ The resulting picture is of an epic tradition that is unceasingly innovative, and constantly reacting to its own innovations.

Yet innovation can only be part of the picture. The interactions we have looked at presuppose the existence of poems in a stable enough form to be interacted with.²²² For such interaction to work, familiarity would seem to be required on the part of the audience (not just the poet) with fairly well-defined poems, familiarity which in a performance culture must depend on repeated exposure to (essentially) the same songs.²²³ The poems of the Epic Cycle perhaps offer some support for this possibility. It is a premise of neoanalysis that the post-Homeric poems (according to the conventional dating) of the Cycle preserve the subject matter and the plot of lost pre-Homeric poems: the post-Iliadic *Aethiopsis* preserves the plot of the pre-Iliadic **Memnonis*. Whereas the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* interact so vitally with forerunners of the Cyclical epics, the Cyclical epics were arguably, in the archaic period, surprisingly indifferent to the Homeric poems.²²⁴ We can hardly suppose the Homeric poems and the Epic Cycle to have been independent traditions, given that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* so clearly show themselves to be heirs to the

²²⁰ On *Κλεο-πάτρη* and *Πάτρο-κλος*, see Eustath. on *Il.* 9.556 (ii.808.25–8 van der Valk); Mühlestein 1969: 87 = 1987: 48. Alkyone (*Il.* 9.562) was apparently the traditional name: Willcock 2001 (1964): 449; Hainsworth 1993: 136; J. Griffin 1995: 135–6, 138; Danek 1998b: 90; differently, Edmunds 1997: 431 (answered by Danek 1998b: 90 n. 22). The correspondence Patroklos–Kleopatra presupposes the correspondence Achilleus–Meleagros, both of whom die at the hands of Apollo (Meleagros: 'Hes.' fr. 25.12–13 M-W); Hirschberger 2004: 219; cf. Burgess 2005b: 130 n. 31.

²²¹ The usual problems apply with $\rightarrow$ reifying alternative version.

²²² Cf. Usener 1990: 210.

²²³ But see § 5.19, p. 220 and nn. 391–2. $\rightarrow$ Audience knowledge.

²²⁴ Burgess 2001: 132–71.

same tradition as the Cyclical epics. We might, however, suppose that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* represent a particularly innovative or interactive strain of the early epic tradition, and that the poems of the Epic Cycle represent on the whole a conservative and reproductive strain.

Such duality may be paralleled in the other main genres of archaic and classical Greek poetry: lyric and tragedy. Lyric poetry prized new compositions. The *locus classicus* is Pindar's injunction to 'praise an old wine, but garlands of songs that are newer' (O.9.48–9), and in several other places lyric poets advertise their compositions as 'new'.²²⁵ But this emphasis on 'new songs' presupposes a context where 'old songs' were also a possibility; and indeed we hear of a strong conservatism in the lyric tradition whereby old songs were reperformed.²²⁶ Similarly with tragedy. Innovation was rated highly: competition at the City Dionysia in the fifth century was, as a rule, with new plays. But old tragedies were regularly revived in the fifth century, both at 'Rural Dionysia' (in the Attic demes) and outside Attica.²²⁷ After Aeschylus' death, 'old' tragedies were increasingly admitted at the City Dionysia.²²⁸ Within both the lyric and the tragic tradition, then, we see the creation of the new and the preservation of the old being valued side by side.²²⁹

Within the epic tradition we are accustomed to thinking of active creation and passive reproduction as the provinces respectively of the *αοιδός* and the *ῥαψωδός*.²³⁰ This distinction is often diachronically conceived: rhapsodes 'replaced' *aidoi* in (perhaps) the late sixth century BC.²³¹ The distinction may also be conceived synchronically. Comparative study of oral poetic traditions suggests that 'creative' and 'reproductive' singers often exist side by side.²³² R. Finnegan warned in general against adopting a 'monolithic

²²⁵ Alc. fr. 3.1–3 (supplemented), 14(a).1–3 PMG; Pind. N.8.20–1, O.3.4–6, I.5.62–3; Bacch. 9.9; Timoth. 791.202–36, esp. 202–5, 211–12 PMG; Ar. Lys. 1295. D'Angour 2011: 191–5.

²²⁶ Hdt. 4.35.3; Timoth. 791.211–12, 791.216–17, 796 PMG; Plat. Leg. 802a; Athen. 14.632f; Polyb. 4.20.8–10. Cf. Plat. Symp. 187d1–2. Herington 1985: 207–10.

²²⁷ Plat. Resp. 475d. Cf. Whitehead 1986: 212, 222 n. 74. Cf. Hdt. 6.21.2. Csapo and Slater 1994: 14–17; Taplin 1999: 37–43.

²²⁸ Cf. Ar. Acharn. 9–11, Ran. 868; Σ Ar. Acharn. 10c; cf. TGrF iii T 1.48–9, 51–2, T 133. In 387/6 BC, competition with an 'old play' became a regular feature of the City Dionysia: IG II².2318 col. 8 = TGrF i p. 24 (Fasti); cf. IG II².2319–2323 = TGrF i pp. 25–7 (Didaskaliai for 341–339 BC).

²²⁹ Cf. Plat. Tim. 21b3–7, for reperformance of the 'recent' poems of Solon alongside older compositions in rhapsodic competitions of late archaic Athens.

²³⁰ See also § 1.4, pp. 16, 20–1, on singers and rhapsodes. So, e.g., Kirk 1962: 91; Heubeck 1974: 142, 149–50; cf. Danek 2006a: 73 (intervention in *Fondation Hardt* round-table discussion; cf. *ibid.* 65–6). Differently, Nagy 1990b: 42: 'It is simplistic and even misleading to contrast ... the "creative" *aidós* with the "reduplicating" *rhapsōidós*'; cf. M. L. West 2011*h*: 745. But see esp. Pelliccia 2003, esp. 103, 106, 113.

²³¹ Burkert 1987: 48–9 = 2001: 205–6; cf. Hainsworth 1988: 30; Latacz 2008: 522.

²³² Kirk 1960: 278–9; Finnegan 1977: 57; cf. 83–4, 142–3; Danek 2011: 300.

theory' of oral poetry, an exclusive model of *either* composition in performance *or* the reproduction of fixed texts.²³³ My account of interaction between poems in the early epic tradition presupposes both 'creation' and 'reproduction' in the tradition.²³⁴ Although it was only in the late sixth century in Athens that rhapsodic performance of the Homeric poems became institutionalized and an 'official' text of Homer was established (the 'Pisistratean recension'), these efforts to ensure the faithful reproduction of a 'fixed' text of Homer²³⁵ can have been formalizations of something present less formally in the tradition much earlier.²³⁶ We see this kind of development for tragedy. There had been a practice of reperforming old tragedies since the (early) fifth century BC, but their reperformance only became institutionalized at the City Dionysia in 386 BC, and official texts of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides were established only in c.330 BC.²³⁷ An interest in reperforming old songs and in 'fixed' texts could comfortably predate their formalization. This suggests one further way of conceptualizing the differences between the Homeric epics and those of the Cycle: the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* would represent the output of highly gifted, creative, singers in the tradition, while the Cyclical epics would reflect its more reproductive side.²³⁸

²³³ Finnegan 1977: 86; cf. 139–53, esp. 153.

²³⁴ Cf. Scodel 2002: 19 'Two opposing forces work on this process. On the one hand, constant change allows a tradition to adapt to changing circumstances... On the other hand, some traditions are very conservative.'

²³⁵ Cf. Bakker 1993: 16–17; 1997: 31. Differently, Jensen 2000: 63.

²³⁶ The Homeridai will have been in possession of texts of Homer before the 'Pisistratean recension', whose function must likewise have been to ensure as far as possible verbatim reproductions of the poems; cf. Janko 1992: 31.

²³⁷ Easterling 1997: 213, on the fourth-century formalization of a long-standing practice of tragic reperformance. On the establishment of official tragic texts in c.330 BC, see Csapo and Slater 1994: 4 and 10 no. 14. Cf. Scodel 2007: 150–2.

²³⁸ For other types of contrast between the Homeric and the Cyclical poems, see J. Griffin 1977 (fundamental differences in aesthetics and conception); Nagy 1990a: 70–3; 2015: 63–5 (Homeric epics as more Panhellenic, Cyclical epics as more local); Burgess 2006: 149 (Homeric epics as 'metacyclic', categorically different from and parasitic on the Cyclical poems).

The Archaic Hymns to Demeter

3.1 The Early Hexameter Hymns to Demeter

This chapter will present a further test case of the interaction between poems in the early hexameter tradition: that of the ‘Homeric’ *Hymn to Demeter* with earlier poetry on the Rape of Persephone.¹ There were several hexameter compositions on the Rape of Persephone current in Attica in the archaic and/or early classical period. Apart from *HDem*, ascribed to ‘Homer’, we know of early hexameter *Hymns to Demeter* ascribed to Orpheus, Musaeus, Eumolpus, and Pamphos.² Ancient tradition, for what that is worth, regularly placed these poets before Homer.³ In any event there is no warrant to assume that *HDem* is the oldest of the attested *Hymns to Demeter*.⁴ A couple of verses of Hesiod’s *Theogony* (912–14) imply that the Rape of Persephone was a subject of hexameter verse as early as the eighth century, perhaps a century and a half before *HDem*. All the attested archaic *Hymns to Demeter* had associations with Attica.⁵ There is a notable degree of conformity between them. In the first instance, this concerns certain stable elements of the plot: the abduction of Persephone by Hades, Demeter’s search for Persephone, Demeter’s hospitable reception by the Eleusinians, Demeter’s rewarding of the Eleusinians with the gift of agriculture and/or her mysteries. Second, certain specific motifs recur in some of them: Persephone’s gathering of flowers before the rape,⁶

¹ A contrastive approach to *HDem*, in terms of traditional referentiality (‘word-power’), is given by J. M. Foley 1995: 160–80.

² Orpheus: P. Derv. xxii.7 (= 398F Bernabé); *Mar. Par.* = *FGrH* 239 A14; P. Berol. 3–5. Musaeus: Paus. 1.22.7, 4.1.5. Eumolpus: Suda ε 3585. Pamphos: Paus. 1.38.3, 1.39.1, 8.37.9, 9.31.9. Furlley 2011: 212, 215–17.

³ Suda ε 3585; Paus. 7.21.9, 9.27.2, 9.29.8; in general, cf. Hdt. 2.23, 2.53; Aristot. *Poet.* 1448b28–9; Philostr. *Her.* 25.2. Cf. Linforth 1941: 159.

⁴ Cf. Malten 1909a: 307.

⁵ Attic context of *HDem*: N. J. Richardson 1974: 6, 12, 56. The *Hymns to Demeter* of Pamphos, Orpheus, and Musaeus were used in the mystery cult of the Lykomid *genos* in the Attic deme of Phyla: Paus. 9.27.2, 9.30.12, 1.22.7, 4.1.5. Eumolpus is eponym of the Eleusinian hierophantic *genos* Eumolpidai.

⁶ Pamphos: Paus. 9.31.9. Orpheus: P. Berol. 60–8; cf. 33–5; cf. AO 1192; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.17.1 (= Bernabé 390F.2). *HDem* 6–8. Divine abductions of girls picking flowers as a traditional motif of early hexameter poetry: N. J. Richardson 1974: 140–1.

Demeter's sitting down by a well in Attica as an old woman.⁷ Third (a point of particular interest for us), there seems to have been at least some recurrent phraseology in the archaic *Hymns to Demeter*. This important fact emerges from confrontation of Hesiod's *Theogony*, lines 912–14 with *HDem* 1–3:

αὐτὰρ ὁ Δήμητρος πολυφόρβης ἐς λέχος ἦλθεν.
ἦ τέκε Περσεφόνην λευκώλενον, ἣν Αἰδωνεύς
ἥρπασεν ἥς παρὰ μητρός, ἔδωκε δὲ μητίετα Ζεὺς.

And he [sc. Zeus] came to the bed of much-nourishing Demeter,
who bore white-armed Persephone, whom Hades
snatched from her mother, and Zeus the schemer gave her.
(Hesiod, *Theogony* 912–14)

Δήμητρ' ἡύκομον σεμνήν θεὰν ἄρχομ' αἰίδειν,
αὐτὴν ἡδὲ θύγατρα πανύσφυρον ἣν Αἰδωνεύς
ἥρπαξεν, δῶκεν δὲ βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς.

I begin my song with Demeter, fair-haired, august goddess,
herself and her daughter of sleek ankles, whom Hades
snatched, and deep-thundering far-seeing Zeus gave her.
(*Hymn to Demeter* 1–3)

The spare, condensed style itself of the Hesiodic⁸ verses implies that the Rape of Persephone was a traditional subject of hexameter poetry before the *Theogony*.⁹ But the detailed correspondences between them and the opening verses of *HDem* imply that this traditional poetry had, in addition to recurrent episodes and motifs, at least some fixity of text, in the form of recurrent verses or phraseology.¹⁰

3.2 The Orphic *Hymn to Demeter* and P. Berol. 13044

Consider now a fragmentarily preserved *Hymn to Demeter* ascribed to Orpheus.¹¹ Our knowledge of the latter poem is due to a papyrus text written in the first

⁷ Pamphos: Paus. 1.39.1. Orpheus: P. Berol. 52–6. *HDem* 98–112.

⁸ The authenticity of the verses has been defended by G. P. Edwards 1971: 198–9; Janko 1982: 85–7, 221; Dräger 1997: 1–26; differently, e.g. M. L. West 1966: 398–9.

⁹ In general, on the implications of the → 'condensed style', cf. Kullmann 1960: 287 and n. 1 'knappe[r] Stil'; Danek 1998a: 42 'Index' s.v. 'Referatstil.'

¹⁰ See (on *HDem* 1 = *HHom* 13.1, *HDem* 493 ~ *HHom* 13.2) Cantilena 1982: 291 'Sono versi che provengono dal materiale tradizionale'; ibid. 307, for the likelihood that 'Esiodo introduce nel suo poema [sc. *Theogony*] dei versi già tradizionali'.

¹¹ Or possibly Musaeus: cf. Janko 2001: 29 n. 168.

century BC, now in Berlin.¹² I refer to this as 'the Berlin papyrus' ('P. Berol.'), of which a translation may be found in Appendix B. The standard edition of the papyrus was for a long time Otto Kern's *Orphicorum fragmenta*, but it has been recently re-edited by Alberto Bernabé in the second part of his *Poetae epici Graeci*.¹³ The papyrus contains verbatim quotations of the poem (twenty-six verses are extant, in whole or in part) and a paraphrase in prose of much of the poem's plot (it is controversial exactly how much).¹⁴ The paraphrase relates a version of the Rape of Persephone which is clearly different from that of *HDem*; however, the verses cited are all but identical with verses of *HDem*, and thus raise difficult questions. What is their relation to the different hexameter verses which are cited as coming from an (early?) 'Orphic' *Hymn to Demeter* by other sources (the Derveni papyrus, Pseudo-Justin Martyr, and Clement of Alexandria)?¹⁵ And, most critically for our purposes, what is their relation to *HDem*?

On this last question, two basic positions have been taken.¹⁶ First, that the verses in P. Berol. derive from a poem distinct from *HDem*.¹⁷ This position invites further questions: whether this distinct poem is derived from *HDem*, is itself a source for *HDem*, or simply stands in a common tradition with *HDem*: these are questions to which we will return.¹⁸ The second position is that the verses in the Berlin papyrus are just quotations of our Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, in a 'wild' or rhapsodic text.¹⁹ This view is recommended by the fact that the verses quoted in the papyrus are virtually identical with verses of

¹² P. Berol. 13044. The text in question is on the verso of the papyrus; the texts on the recto are dated to ii BC (Buecheler 1907: 7–8).

¹³ Kern 1922: fr. 49; Bernabé 2004a: fr. 386–97. Other editions: Buecheler 1907 (*editio princeps*); Colli 1977: 218–29, 410–11; Scarpi 2002: 380–8, 398–9, 644–7, 651–2. Bernabé's edition does not conduce to a sequential reading of the papyrus, which it presents as follows: P. Berol. 1–14 = fr. 383 Bernabé, 15–32 = fr. 387, 33–4 = fr. 388.(II), 34–45 = fr. 389.(I), 45–51 = fr. 392.(I), 52–60 = fr. 393, 60–8 = fr. 388.(I), 69–75 = 389.(II), 75–80 = 392.(II), 81–118 = fr. 396, 118–20 = 397.(II).

¹⁴ On the question whether the end of P. Berol. is the end of the paraphrase, see, differently, Wilcken in Kern 1922: 124, on P. Berol. 120; N. J. Richardson 1974: 81.

¹⁵ Bernabé presents the verse cited by the Derveni commentator (fr. 398 Bernabé) as coming from a different poem from that of the verses cited in P. Berol., but presents the verses cited by Pseudo-Justin and Clement (fr. 386, 395 Bernabé) as coming from the same poem as the verses cited in P. Berol. (p. 311 'ex eadem recensione venire possunt'), following a principle tentatively formulated by N. J. Richardson 1974: 79. See Bernabé 2004a: 311; 2008: 409; cf. also Colli 1977: 410–11.

¹⁶ Bernabé 2008: 409; Graf 2008: 679.

¹⁷ So Buecheler 1907: 16–17; Kern 1922: 124–5; Wilamowitz 1955: ii.47–8; Colli 1977: 410; Janko 1986; Bernabé 2004a: 311, 313–30, where P. Berol. is seen as providing 'fragmenta' ('F'), not 'testimonia' ('T'), of an Orphic poem on the Rape of Persephone; cf. Graf 1974: 153–8.

¹⁸ For the first of these positions, Buecheler 1907: 17; Kern 1922: 124–5. For the second, Böhme 1991: 51; cf. 1988: 28 n. 9.

¹⁹ Allen, Halliday, and Sikes 1936: 110; Krüger 1938: 352; M. L. West 1983: 24 and n. 63; 2003c: 8. N. J. Richardson 1974: 66–7 treats P. Berol. 13044 as a manuscript witness to *HDem* ('pap. 1' in the 'Sigla', p. 93), but recognizes that in some cases we have deliberate adaptations, not just textual variants, of *HDem*. According to Càssola 1975: 34, 'I passi in esametri discendono da un'edizione dell'inno diversa dalla nostra [sc. *HDem*], ma non necessariamente orfica.'

HDem, whereas the many fewer verses cited by the other sources as coming from an 'Orphic' *Hymn to Demeter* are wholly unlike verses from *HDem*. Moreover, such divergences as are found between the verses in the papyrus and their counterparts in *HDem* are (with one significant exception: *HDem* 54–6 and P. Berol. 102–5, to be discussed presently) consistent with what we would expect from ancient manuscripts of a single early hexameter text.²⁰ This view would entail that the Berlin commentator saw *HDem* as the work of Orpheus, not Homer; but for that, too, there may be parallels.²¹ This view, although it commands notable scholarly support, involves significant difficulties.

First, the commentator purports to be working from one and the same poem, whether paraphrasing it in prose or quoting hexameter verses from it. If he is doing what he purports to be, he must be quoting from a different poem from *HDem*, for the paraphrase is incompatible with *HDem*. We must then assume that the poem that lay behind the Berlin papyrus contained several verses which diverged significantly from the verses of *HDem*, even though the commentator does not (with one possible partial exception, to be discussed presently) actually quote any such verses.²² On the alternative view, that the commentator was quoting the verses from *HDem*, he must, contrary to his indications, have been following different sources for the paraphrase and for the verse citations. Something like this is the assumption of those scholars who see the prose paraphrase as testimony to a lost 'Orphic' *Hymn to Demeter*, but do not see the verses quoted in the papyrus as coming from a lost 'Orphic' poem. This makes the commentator's procedure extremely hard to understand. It becomes either inept (if the commentator has failed to realize that the plot of *HDem* is different from his paraphrase)²³ or deceptive (if the commentator intends the reader not to realize; but how could such an intent ever succeed?); there do not seem to be any grounds to impute a playful or humorous intent. It is true that our interpretation of the Berlin papyrus is in general hampered by our ignorance of the agenda of the commentator, as of his identity.²⁴ But on this view it seems that we must resign hope even of making sense of what he is about.

²⁰ In general: Haslam 1997: 64–9; cf. M. L. West 2001a: 14. → Rhapsodic variation.

²¹ Allen, Halliday, and Sikes 1936: 110: '[P. Berol.] shows... that poems of the Homeric corpus were appropriated at this period by the Orphics'; N. J. Richardson 1974: 12: 'the *Homeric Hymn* was taken over and attributed to Orpheus'. Comparably, P. Derv. xxvi.5–7 suggests an ascription of *Il.* 24.527–8 to 'Orpheus', rather than 'Homer', assuming that at P. Derv. xxvi.2, 5 *δηλοῖ* is used personally, with Orpheus as subject (cf. P. Derv. xiii.3, xvi.9, xxi.1): Funghi 1997: 27; Obbink 1997: 41 n. 4; Betegh 2004: 100 and n. 25; differently, Kouremenos, Parássoglou, and Tsantsanoglou 2006: 20 n. 46, 272.

²² Krüger 1938: 352 is understandably suspicious of this coincidence. However, the problems do not seem fewer on alternative views of P. Berol.

²³ The assumption of Krüger 1938: 352.

²⁴ Cf. Buecheler 1907: 17 n. 1.

Second, it is not possible to argue that the Berlin commentator quoted from *HDem* because there was no other poem for him to quote from. Around the middle of the third century BC (a *terminus ante quem*, therefore), the Parian Marble attests the existence of '(hexameter) poetry on the rape of Persephone and the search of Demeter' attributed to Orpheus.²⁵ From the scanty indications of the Parian chronicle, the plot of this 'Orphic' poetry seems to have both diverged from that of *HDem* and converged in essentials with that of the paraphrase of the Berlin papyrus.²⁶ Given the availability, perhaps widespread, of such a poem on the Rape of Persephone—which was distinct from *HDem*, was ascribed to 'Orpheus', and had a plot apparently conformable to what the Berlin commentator required—it is hard to account for the failure of the commentator to use this poem. Or (to make the same point the other way round) the independent attestations, from at least the third or fourth centuries BC, of just such an 'Orphic' poem make it likely that the commentator was drawing on a poem distinct from *HDem*, ascribed to Orpheus, and, if not identical with the poem referred to in the Parian marble, then substantially similar to it.²⁷

Third, it is impossible in all instances to regard the verses cited by the Berlin papyrus as coming just from a wild or rhapsodic text of *HDem*: we come here to the significant exception already alluded to. Three verses in the papyrus (P. Berol. lines 102–5 = fr. 396.22–24 Bernabé) indicate a version in which Demeter came to Eleusis ignorant of the identity of Persephone's abductor, and thus embody a conception of plot incompatible with that of *HDem*, even though their wording is still extremely close to lines 54–6 of *HDem* (we will return to these verses presently).²⁸ At the very least we would have to assume that the commentator, if drawing on *HDem* for these verses, has wilfully tampered with them.²⁹ Again, this would involve the imputation of a deceptive or disingenuous procedure to the commentator and, perhaps harder still, the assumption of a public capable of being duped. Such a scenario

²⁵ *FGrH* 239 A14. The *terminus ante quem* can probably be pushed further back, to iv BC: Asclepiades (*FGrH* 12 F4) and Palaephatus (*FGrH* = *BNJ* 44 F1), probably after an 'Orphic' poem (cf. Jacoby *FGrH* 1a p.485 on *FGrH* 12 F4; N. J. Richardson 1974: 82; Graf 1974: 159–60. In general, 'Orphic Hymns' are attested in v–iv BC (P. Derv. xxii.12; Plat. *Leg.* 829d8–e1) and were available to read in AD ii (Paus. 9.30.12). The archaic-classical 'Orphic' Hymn(s) to Demeter is (are) probably reflected in Eur. *Hel.* 1301–68 (Kannicht 1969: 343) and AO 26–7, 1191–6 (cf. fr. 380–1 Bernabé; Vian 1987: 16; Nelis 2005: 170). Different from these early 'Orphic Hymns' is the extant collection (AD iv?) of 'Orphic' Hymns, of which no. 41 is to Demeter ('Meter Antaia'): Betegh 2004: 222; Furley 2011: 214 n. 33; cf. Morand 2001: 89–90.

²⁶ The crucial divergence from *HDem* and convergence with P. Berol. consists in Demeter's gift of agriculture to the Eleusinians: *Mar. Par.* = *FGrH* 239 A14 τὸν ὑποδεξαμένον τὸν καρπὸν. Cf. Graf 2008: 684.

²⁷ Cf. Buecheler 1907: 16.

²⁸ These three lines of the papyrus sit awkwardly with the view of Allen, Halliday, and Sikes 1936: 110: 'The passages quoted as from Orpheus or Musaeus show several variants from the text of the hymn given in M, but they do not amount to a new version' (italics added).

²⁹ Cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 67.

is all the harder to endorse without a convincing account of the commentator's agenda and procedure.

These three points are weighty enough, I believe, to warrant the assumption that the verses cited in the papyrus derive from a poem distinct from *HDem*. The assumption, I contend, is warranted; I do not maintain that it is inescapable or without problems of its own, only that it is viable enough for its implications to be worth exploring, the more so as these implications are interesting ones. I hereafter make the assumption that the commentator is working, as he purports to be, in both the paraphrase and the verse citations, with a poem distinct from *HDem*; and I call that poem 'the *Hymn to Demeter* in the Berlin papyrus' ('*HDemPBerol*' for short). This assumption can still accommodate the view that *HDemPBerol* consists to a large extent of verses adapted from *HDem*; it excludes only the view that the commentator is drawing directly and exclusively on *HDem*. For the rest of this piece I forgo further discussion of these first-order questions about the status of the verses in the papyrus and address myself to the second-order question: which of these two poems depends on which. Scholarship has provided absolute dates for both poems: a current consensus places *HDem* in the earlier sixth century,³⁰ while *HDemPBerol* has been dated variously to the late sixth and the later fifth century.³¹ The dating of *HDemPBerol* in particular rests on slippery criteria.³² The mythology behind the poem, at least, must be as old as the mid-sixth century BC, if a reference to 'swineherd Eubouleus' (*Εὐβουλεὺ τε συμβῶτα*) is correctly read in a fragment of Anacreon.³³ It is prudent to keep an open mind about both the relative dating and the relationship of the two poems.³⁴

3.3 P. Berol. and the Reconstruction of 'Sources' of *HDem*

On the one hand, it is often granted by scholars that *HDem* takes in general an innovative and allusive approach to the traditional Attic myth;³⁵ and it is

³⁰ N. J. Richardson 1974: 5–11; Janko 1982: 183; H. P. Foley 1994: 29–30; M. L. West 2003c: 9.

³¹ Late vi BC: Malten 1909b: 427 (pointing to the circle of Onomakritos); Kolb 1977: 114–15; cf. other references in Graf 1974: 178 n. 105. Later v BC: Graf 1974: 179–81 (dating the poem to 468–405 BC, and arguing for the authorship of Lampon or one of his immediate circle). In general: H. P. Foley 1994: 99 n. 62; Parker 1996: 101 n. 141.

³² Graf 1974 makes much of the transition from uncultivated to cultivated existence, relating it to later v-BC sophistic thought and to Sophocles' *Triptolemus*.

³³ Bernsdorff 2011: 29–31. The fact that Anacreon's pherecratean could begin a hexameter might suggest that Anacreon has an epic model in view, but if so, this could be *HDemPBerol* or a forerunner of *HDemPBerol* or simply the *Odyssey* (cf. *Εὐμαίε συμβῶτα* x 16 in the *Odyssey*); Mühlestein 1984 = 1987 in a speculative argument actually sees the *Odyssey*'s Eumaios as modelled on Eubouleus. My thanks to Prof. H. Bernsdorff for discussion of these questions.

³⁴ So Colli 1977: 410.

³⁵ So N. J. Richardson 1974: 84–5; Clay 1989: 205, 224–5; H. P. Foley 1994: 97–101; cf. Parker 1996: 100–1.

granted that *HDem* redeploys at least some traditional phraseology, in the light of the comparison of *HDem* 1–3 with Hes. *Th.* 912–14.³⁶ On the other hand, it is commonly assumed that the paraphrase of the Berlin papyrus provides testimony to the traditional Attic myth with which *HDem* is engaging;³⁷ but it is almost universally denied that the verses cited in the papyrus constitute traditional verses to which *HDem* may be reacting.³⁸ Partly this is a consequence of the view of the verses in the papyrus as mere quotations, with or without deliberate adaptation, from *HDem*. Partly too it is due to principled assumptions, for the asymmetrical treatment of myth and wording here mirrors that currently prevailing in Homeric scholarship: while a number of scholars allow that (say) the *Cypria*, *Aethiopis*, or *Little Iliad* may preserve pre-Homeric myth to which the *Iliad* alludes (→ mythological intertextuality), few allow that they preserve pre-Homeric phrasing to which the *Iliad* alludes.³⁹ It is against this background that I mean to argue for two propositions. First, that *HDem* presupposes and alludes to earlier Attic hexameter poetry on the Rape of Persephone, and does so on levels of plot, motif, and phraseology that exceed the prevailing models of mythological intertextuality or traditional referentiality. Second, that the Berlin papyrus gives us access, direct or indirect, to the earlier Attic hexameter poetry on the Rape of Persephone to which *HDem* alludes. The argument parallels that of more mainstream neoanalysis, and will be structured around three related putative techniques of allusion in *HDem*: motif transference (and verbatim quotation); narrative inconsistency; and the use of character-text to allude to a traditional version.

3.4 *HDem* Alludes by Transferred Motif and Transferred Wording?

Our first technique is allusion by transferred motif and, more controversially, by transferred wording, i.e. verbatim quotation. It can be exemplified by a well-known neoanalytical argument from *Iliad* 18.22–71: Achilles, Thetis, and the Nereids lamenting Patroklos' death is held to recall Achilles' own

³⁶ Cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 74, 137; Clay 1989: 210 and n. 24; cf. Böhme 1953: 62 and 1970: 76–7. In Hes. *Th.* 886–929 (catalogue of Zeus' unions with goddesses) there appears to be much allusion to traditional mythical material: N. J. Richardson 1974: 137. Compare the situation with ⇒ *HHerm* 1–9 and *HHom* 18.1–9 (see § 1.4, p. 14). Janko 2012: 21 n. 3: 'the case of the *Hymn to Hermes*, where the opening verses survive in two versions with oral variants . . . , shows that short passages comprising the beginnings of Homeric Hymns were so traditional that they could have a relatively fixed form over extended periods of time'.

³⁷ e.g. Bernabé 2004a: 328 note on line 21.

³⁸ A solitary, if persistent, voice has been Böhme 1970: 75–111; 1983: 16–27, and elsewhere.

³⁹ M. W. Edwards 1991: 17: 'few would hold that passages in the *Il[iad]* were taken verbatim from other epics'; Burgess 2001: 133–4. Differently, Dowden 1996: 59; R. L. Fowler 2004: 229–30; cf. Burgess 2012a.

funeral as this was narrated in earlier epic poetry (**Memnonis (Aethiopsis)*: see §§ 2.3, 4.4). The detailed motifs of such a scene seem to be reflected at *Od.* 24.39–64 and in the Proclan Summary of the *Aethiopsis* (Bernabé p. 69, lines 20–1). But beyond detailed correspondence of motifs, the phrase μέγας μεγαλωστί.../ κείτο (*Il.* 18.26–7), applied to the prostrate Achilles on learning of the death of Patroklos, closely corresponds to *Od.* 24.40 | κείσο μέγας μεγαλωστί, applied to the prostrate Achilles at his own death. Neoanalysts have thus argued that the *Iliad* may have quoted verbatim earlier poetry on Achilles' own funeral. This argument, therefore, finds in the Iliadic passage both a transferred motif and verbatim quotation. Moreover, it assumes that the transference is allusive.⁴⁰ The 'ideal' audience is to sense both the difference of the Iliadic scene from the scene of the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* and its similarity to it; perception of the 'source-text' behind the 'target-text' is crucial to the understanding of the scene.⁴¹ A final point worth emphasizing is that transference of the motif to a new context implies that the poet will not go on to employ the motif in the traditional way. Having conveyed—symbolically, allusively, proleptically—the death of Achilles, the *Iliad* poet is not going subsequently to narrate the death of Achilles (along traditional lines, or at all).⁴²

Consider now *HDem* 51–90: Demeter converses with Hekate and Helios and learns from the latter that Hades has abducted Persephone. The scene seems to evoke a functionally equivalent scene in earlier poetic treatments of the Rape of Persephone: a scene of revelation in which Demeter learned from the Eleusinians that Persephone has been abducted by Hades. Such a scene is described in the paraphrase of the Berlin papyrus (P. Berol. 102–19 = fr. 396–7 Bernabé). It must, moreover, have been standard in the Attic version, where it was very likely an important, climactic scene.⁴³ The role of Helios as Demeter's informant in *HDem* appears to be an innovation of the Homeric hymn; it may be considered 'secondary', whereas the role of the Eleusinians as informants is (in Attic tradition) 'primary'.⁴⁴ But it is important also to recognize that the version of *HDem* necessarily excludes the standard Attic version: a plot in which an Olympian (Helios) acts as Demeter's informant rules out one in which Eleusinians (Triptolemos) play that role. That is

⁴⁰ Cf. in general Burgess 2006: 177: 'whereas traditional neoanalysts have reserved discernment of motif transference to the scholar, it is more probable that the reflection would be recognized by a mythologically informed audience. In this case motif transference is more than coincidental, casual, or merely vestigial. It is significant allusion, at least in an oral, intertextually neoanalytic manner.'

⁴¹ R. B. Rutherford 1996: 118–19; cf. Scodel 2002: 4–5.

⁴² Pace M. L. West 2003b: 7–8. See Appendix C.

⁴³ Paus. 1.14.3 attests a hexameter poem of 'Orpheus' in which the Eleusinians made the disclosure to Demeter and were rewarded by her. Isocr. 4.28 implies the same (α μυθώδης ... λόγος). N. J. Richardson 1974: 259; cf. Krüger 1938: 354–5.

⁴⁴ On the identity of Demeter's traditional informants: N. J. Richardson 1974: 81, 259. The terms 'primary' and 'secondary', and their associated problems: Burgess 2006a: 158–61.

already, in effect, an allusion: the Hekate–Helios scene in *HDem* derives part of its meaning from what it, by implication, excludes. Nothing less is at stake here than the *aition* of the traditional Attic myth: if Demeter is not helped by the Eleusinians to recover Persephone, then she cannot institute agriculture and/or the mysteries at Eleusis out of gratitude for the Eleusinians' help.⁴⁵ *HDem* thus tacitly advertises a radically different treatment of plot, and so signals a competitive relationship with the traditional Attic version.

The allusive relationship between these two scenes seems to be highlighted by transferred motifs: comparison of *HDem* 51–90 and P. Berol. 102–19 (from the paraphrase) reveals a suggestively similar constellation of narrative details. Both narratives present an inconclusive preliminary conversation between two females (Demeter and Baubo in P. Berol., Hekate and Demeter in *HDem*) followed shortly by the decisive revelation from a male (Triptolemos in P. Berol., Helios in *HDem*).⁴⁶ Within this basic common pattern there are inversions of detail. In *HDem*, Demeter is questioned by Hekate, whereas in *HDemPBerol* Demeter questions Baubo; in *HDem*, Demeter and Hekate go to meet Helios, whereas in P. Berol. (the paraphrase) Baubo and Demeter are themselves met by Triptolemos returning from the field. Our scene in *HDem*, therefore, apparently presents motif transference combined with → opposition in imitation. Here, the neoanalytical approach seems to impose itself strongly: the motif seems too specific to the Demeter myth to be regarded as a type-scene; and priority for the motif seems to be assured: the context of the Berlin papyrus is primary, that of *HDem* secondary.⁴⁷

Apart from transference of motif, there is also arguably verbatim quotation. Compare the three lines in which Hekate addresses Demeter at *HDem* 54–6:

πότνια Δημήτηρ ὥρηφόρε ἀγλαόδωρε
 τίς θεῶν οὐρανίων ἤ ἐ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
 ἤρπασε Περσεφόνην καὶ σὸν φίλον ἥκαχε θυμόν;

⁴⁵ The Eleusinians' disclosure as the *αἴτιον* for the institution of agriculture/the mysteries at Eleusis: cf. Isocr. 4.28; Paus. 1.14.3. Parker 1991: 9; H. P. Foley 1994: 152; Bernabé 2008: 411 and n. 97.

⁴⁶ From a neoanalytical perspective, the motif of Triptolemos as witness to the rape and as Demeter's informant is transferred to Helios (→ transferred motif). The Sun is, of course, in his own right an appropriate enough witness of and informant on the rape: Walcot 1966: 92; N. J. Richardson 1974: 156–7, 171; Penglase 1994: 134 with n. 21. The Sun as witness: cf. *Il.* 3.276; as informant: cf. *Od.* 8.302. But Helios is also a peculiarly appropriate stand-in for Triptolemos, since the two of them share the highly unusual prerogative of being conveyed over the world in an airborne chariot (Triptolemos: Soph. fr. 596 *TGrF*; *LIMC* s.v. 'Triptolemos', *passim*; Helios: *HDem* 88–9). For the possibility of iconographic confusion between the two, cf. Mastronarde 2002: 377, to which add Sen. *Med.* 1022–5). Compare § 2.3, p. 64, for Sarpedon as a peculiarly appropriate stand-in for Memnon.

⁴⁷ Böhme 1983: 21: 'Die Frage als Ganzes ist primär die der suchenden Mutter: sie an Demeter richten zu lassen—als ob diese es wüsste—ist wenig sinnvoll und fraglos sekundär. Kein Zufall dass Hekate von Demeter gar keine Antwort erhält.' (However, the adaptation of the motif in *HDem* should not be seen as 'wenig sinnvoll', but as consciously allusive; even the → inconsequentiality of the scene in *HDem* may be part of the point: see § 3.5).

Lady Demeter, bringer of seasons, giver of splendid gifts,
 who of the heavenly gods or of mortal men
 snatched Persephone and grieved your dear heart?

with the three lines in which Demeter addresses Baubo in *HDemPBerol*
 (P. Berol. 102–5 = fr. 396.22–4 Bernabé):

εἰμὶ δὲ Δη[μ]ήτηρ ὥρηφόρ[ος ἀγλαό]δωρος.
 τίς θεὸς οὐράνιος ἢ ἐθν[η]τῶ[ν ἀνθρώ]πων
 ἥρπασε Φερσεφ[ό]νην καὶ [ἐὸν φίλον ἥπα]φρε θυμόν;

I am Demeter, bringer of seasons, giver of splendid gifts.
 Which heavenly god or who of mortal men
 snatched Persephone and deceived her dear heart?

On one view, the papyrus here adapts the verses of *HDem*: to be precise, P. Berol.'s εἰμὶ δὲ Δη[μ]ήτηρ ὥρηφόρ[ος ἀγλαό]δωρος combines *HDem* 268 | εἰμὶ δὲ Δημήτηρ with *HDem* 54 ὥρηφόρε ἀγλαόδωρε|. ⁴⁸ This is effectively to regard *HDemPBerol* as a → cento of *HDem*. ⁴⁹ This view, however, has its problems, not least the hiatus ὥρηφόρε ἀγλαόδωρε at *HDem* 54. In early Greek hexameter poetry hiatus frequently results from the adaptation of a traditional formula to an untraditional context. ⁵⁰ In this case the traditional formula is evidently the nominative, Δημήτηρ ὥρηφόρος ἀγλαόδωρος, the form we find elsewhere in *HDem* (193). ⁵¹ A second anomaly in the same verse (*HDem* 54) is the use of the nominative Δημήτηρ for the vocative Δήμητερ. ⁵² On the two other occasions in *HDem* where a vocative of the goddess is required, we do find Δήμητερ. ⁵³ These linguistic anomalies together seem to expose *HDem* 54 as making untraditional use of traditional language. ⁵⁴ On the other hand, the papyrus' verse εἰμὶ δὲ Δη[μ]ήτηρ ὥρηφόρ[ος ἀγλαό]δωρος conforms to what we would expect of a traditional use of the formula. ⁵⁵ It would be strange for the more traditional-seeming verse to come about by imitation of the less traditional-seeming one.

⁴⁸ N. J. Richardson 1974: 67, 81, 169.

⁴⁹ Similar views have been taken of ⇒ *Little Iliad* fr. 21.3–4 Bernabé and ⇒ *HAPH* 58–64 (§§ 4.3, 5.7).

⁵⁰ M. Parry 1971: 191–239 = 1928: 1–65; G. P. Edwards 1971: 90–3. ⁵¹ Cf. *HDem* 492.

⁵² The nominative is felt to be so anomalous by Càssola 1975: 470 (after Ilgen) as to need emendation.

⁵³ *HDem* 75, 321.

⁵⁴ Böhme 1983: 21; cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 170.

⁵⁵ This is not to say that *HDemPBerol* consistently exhibits more traditional formulaic usage than *HDem*, and it is far from clear that it does. (1) *HDem* 55 θεῶν (in synizesis) and P. Berol. 103 θεός: Böhme 1983: 21: 'Das τίς θεῶν οὐρανίων ist mit seiner Synizese Umformung aus τίς θεός οὐράνιος, nicht umgekehrt.' (Cf. Hoekstra 1969: 49: 'In general, synizesis results from a secondary development.') But θεῶν οὐρανίων can be regarded rather as a modification of θεοὶ οὐρανίωτες (Cantilena 1982: 181). (2) *HDem* 418 Φαινώ and *HDemPBerol* Φανέρη: the form φανερός is otherwise absent from early Greek hexameter poetry (an observation I owe to Prof. A. Maravela); in this case, therefore, the form presented by *HDemPBerol* is likely to be younger.

Various parallel arguments point in the same direction: in terms of plot, the papyrus' version (where Eleusinians act as Demeter's informants) conforms to the traditional Attic version, whereas the version of *HDem* departs from it; on the level of wording, *HDemPBerol* exhibits a traditional use of a formula, whereas *HDem* deploys that formula innovatively. The conclusions that suggest themselves are, first, that the verse *εἰμι δὲ Δημήτηρ ὠρηφόρος ἀγλαόδωρος* was a traditional verse spoken by Demeter in the context of her self-revelation to the Eleusinians in (some) early Attic hexameter poetry on the Rape of Persephone; second, that *HDemPBerol* reflects that traditional poetry; and third, that *HDem* has allusively transferred those traditional verses from the traditional context of the disclosure at Eleusis to its own innovative scene featuring the Olympians Hekate and Helios. If so, the Berlin papyrus in conjunction with *HDem* offers us a concrete textual example of the kind of verbatim quotation that remains purely conjectural in the case of the *Iliad*'s *μέγας μεγαλωστί.../ κείτο* (*Il.* 18.26–7). The resulting picture is of *HDem* engaging allusively with its tradition, on the level of wording as well as of motif; and P. Berol. seems to reflect that tradition, on both levels.

It should be pointed out that this has no straightforward implications for the relative dates of the poems. A strong position would be that *HDemPBerol* is the very poem alluded to by *HDem* and is therefore older than *HDem*.⁵⁶ But a weaker position can also be adopted: that *HDemPBerol* preserves at least *some* traditional verses that are earlier than and are alluded to by *HDem*. This position would be tenable even if *HDemPBerol* were a more recent poem than *HDem*, and it could be compatible even with the view that *HDemPBerol* is itself dependent in places on *HDem*, provided that this was not the *only* dependence. This is akin to the neoanalytical argument that the Cyclical epics, while drawing on pre-Iliadic material on which the *Iliad* draws, also draw on the *Iliad*.⁵⁷ We will return to such questions later, both in this chapter (§ 3.8) and in others (§§ 4.3, 5.7).

3.5 *HDem* Alludes by Inconsistency between 'Surface' and 'Deep' Layers of Narrative?

We come to the second technique of allusion: allusion to a traditional version highlighted by inconsistency between 'surface' and 'deep' layers of narrative. Again, the technique may be illustrated by resuming a well-known neoanalytical argument discussed in the previous chapter. Neoanalysts have often held that the narrative of Sarpedon's death in *Iliad* XVI is modelled on a traditional

⁵⁶ The view of R. Böhme.

⁵⁷ Kullmann 1960: 17.

Table 3.1. Death of Memnon in *Aethiopis* and Death of Sarpedon in *Iliad* XVI

<i>Aethiopis</i>	<i>Iliad</i> 16.419–61, 666–83
1 Achilles kills Memnon.	Patroklos is about to kill Sarpedon.
2 Eos asks Zeus to make Memnon immortal, and Zeus grants him immortality.	Zeus asks Hera whether he should rescue Sarpedon from imminent death; Hera vehemently rejects the proposal.
3 (Not directly attested for <i>Aethiopis</i> ;) Eos bathes Memnon's corpse, anoints it with ambrosia, and clothes it in immortal clothes.	Apollo bathes Sarpedon's corpse, anoints it with ambrosia, and clothes it in immortal clothes.
4 Eos (assisted by Hypnos and Thanatos?) carries Memnon's corpse to Ethiopia.	Hypnos and Thanatos carry Sarpedon's corpse to Lycia.

narrative of the death and immortalization of Memnon as it is preserved in the *Aethiopis*; the two narratives are compared in Table 3.1.⁵⁸

In the narrative of the *Iliad* there is a notable inconsistency between the text's 'surface' insistence that Sarpedon is not immortalized (16.457 = 675) and the simultaneous suggestions of the text at a 'deep' level of his immortalization, suggestions that are effected both by individual motifs (the translation of the body by Hypnos and Thanatos, the anointing with ambrosia, the clothing in immortal clothes) and by the sequence as a whole (see § 2.3, pp. 64–6). It is possible to see such inconsistencies between 'surface' and 'deep' layers of narrative as an allusive technique, whose effect is to orient the audience simultaneously towards the traditional version and towards its reworking in the present poem: the traditional narrative is both superseded and left vestigially present in the text.

A similar argument was made also in the previous chapter for the relationship between the narrative of *Odyssey* XIX and a hypothetical earlier epic treatment of Odysseus' homecoming in which Penelope recognized Odysseus and conspired with him in the murder of the suitors: on a 'surface' level, the *Odyssey*'s narrative insists that Penelope neither recognizes nor conspires with Odysseus, but at a 'deep' level, individual elements of the narrative and its overall shape intimate a recognition and conspiracy (§ 2.2). This view sees such inconsistencies not as the result of an improvising oral poet caught involuntarily between the conflicting claims of tradition and → innovation, but as evidencing, even advertising, the poet's intention of getting his audience to confront a new version with the old version with which it is in competition.

In *HDem*, we may see a similar tension between 'surface' and 'deep' layers of narrative. Here, however, the evidence of the papyrus is deficient in a couple of places (see 4, 5, and 6 in Table 3.2) and has to be supplemented from other sources for the Attic myth of the Rape of Persephone (see Table 3.2).

⁵⁸ See § 2.3 for details of the reconstruction of the version of the *Aethiopis*.

Table 3.2. Traditional Attic Version of Rape of Persephone and *HDem*

Traditional Attic version of Rape of Persephone (P. Berol., supplemented from other sources)	Homeric <i>Hymn to Demeter</i>
1 Hades descends into the underworld with Persephone near Eleusis. ⁵⁹	Hades descends into the underworld with Persephone, but there is no indication where the descent occurs (33–9).
2 Demeter comes to Eleusis in search of Persephone. ⁶⁰	Demeter comes to Eleusis, but there is no indication why she does so (93–7).
3 Demeter reveals herself to the Eleusinians and is informed by them that Hades has taken Persephone into the underworld. ⁶¹	Demeter reveals herself to the Eleusinians, but receives no information from them (268–83).
4 (Attestation controversial) After the revelation at Eleusis, Demeter descends into the underworld. ⁶²	After the revelation at Eleusis, Demeter withdraws into the temple which has just been built for her at Eleusis (302–4).
5 (Conjectural) Demeter's absence from the upper world causes a famine, necessitating Zeus' intervention. ⁶³	Demeter, secluded in her temple at Eleusis, causes a famine by an act of her will, necessitating Zeus' intervention (305–9).

(continued on p. 92)

⁵⁹ P. Berol. 48. Cf. Krüger 1938: 353; N. J. Richardson 1974: 150 (under (c)).

⁶⁰ Cf. P. Berol. 48–9; cf. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.20.1 (= 392F Bernabé).

⁶¹ Cf. P. Berol. 101–91.

⁶² Cf. P. Berol. 120 ὅθεν κάθοδος λέγ[ε]τ[αι], which I take to refer to a descent into the underworld of Demeter in search of Persephone. Cf. *OH* 41.5–7; Hygin. *Fab.* 251; P. Barc. inv. no. 158–61 ('Barcelona *Alcestitis*'), lines 64–5; cf. Σ Pind. *O.* 6.160c. The myth was probably known to Virgil (*Geo.* 1.39), presumably from a poetic source; N. J. Richardson 1974: 84, 259; Harrison and Obbink 1986. Differently, most commentators have assumed a reference to the descent of Persephone into the underworld with Hades. Bernabé (fr. 397.6–7) actually supplements the text of the papyrus to read ὅθεν κάθοδος λέγ[ε]τ[αι] τῆς Κόρης αὔτην] (following Buecheler 1907: 14, who left the supplement in the apparatus); cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 81. Differently again, Graf 2008: 679 suggests allusion to the ritual descent of the Thesmophoria.

⁶³ Differently, assuming that there was no famine in the Orphic version: Graf 1974: 174–5; 2008: 683; N. J. Richardson 1974: 84, 259–60; H. P. Foley 1994: 152. The motif of the goddess' absence from the upper world causing famine is unattested for the Orphic version, but is conjectured here on the strength of mainly Near Eastern parallels: (1) in the Akkadian *Ishtar's Descent* lines 76–80, 86–90 (Foster 2005: 501–2), Ishtar's absence in the underworld brings an end to reproduction on earth; cf. Graf 1974: 175–6; Burkert 1983: 263 and n. 31; H. P. Foley 1994: 94–5; Penglase 1994: 126–58; cf. 15–38. Chiodi 2000: 25 puts her finger on the singularity of *HDem's* narrative by comparing *HDem* 302–13 with the Akkadian *Ishtar's Descent* lines 77–80: 'Diversamente dal mito mesopotamico la crisi sulla terra viene dunque provocata dalla stessa Demetra, non dalla scomparsa in sé di Persefone rapita dal re degli Inferi e nell'Ade relegata.' (2) In the Ugaritic *Baal and Mot* (Wyatt 2002: 137–9), Baal's absence in the underworld causes famine and drought; cf. Hooke 1963: 84–6; N. J. Richardson 1974: 259. (3) In the Sumerian *In the Desert by the Early Grass* (Jacobsen 1987: 56–84, at 71), the dead Dumuzi's mother searches for him and determines to descend into the underworld after him; cf. Penglase 1994: 31–3, 131–3, 135. (4) In a Greek tradition from Phigalia in Arcadia, Demeter hides away in a cave and causes famine: Paus. 8.42.2. Since agriculture did not exist at the time of the rape in the Attic-Orphic version, the famine would presumably have consisted in a general blight on nature, rather than a suppression of cultivated crops (cf. *HDem* 308–9). Compare the Hittite *Disappearance of Telpinu*, Hoffner 1998: 15, 18; cf. *Disappearance of the Storm God*, ibid. 21.

Table 3.2. Continued from p. 91

Traditional Attic version of Rape of Persephone (P. Berol., supplemented from other sources)	Homeric <i>Hymn to Demeter</i>
6 (Not in P. Berol.) After the recovery of Persephone (?), Demeter instructs the Eleusinians in the mysteries and/or agriculture in gratitude for their information. ⁶⁴	After the recovery of Persephone, Demeter instructs the Eleusinians in her mysteries, but not in the arts of agriculture, and not out of gratitude for any information received (473–82).

According to this reconstruction, the Berlin papyrus offers a version in which Hades descended with Persephone into the underworld at Eleusis, whereupon Demeter followed Persephone's cries to Eleusis, learned from the Eleusinians that Hades had taken Persephone into the underworld, descended into the underworld to retrieve her daughter, and by absenting herself from the upper world caused a famine. Assuming such a traditional version, *HDem* will have preserved most of the key elements in their expected order: Hades takes Persephone into the underworld, Demeter arrives at Eleusis, a famine breaks out. But although most of the key events occur in the same sequence, the events are, explicitly or implicitly, very differently motivated and consequently the significance of the narrative is transformed. Most provocatively in *HDem*, on the 'surface level', Demeter's visit to Eleusis in *HDem* has become irrelevant to her quest for Persephone.⁶⁵ Still, at a 'deep level', individual narrative elements and the general direction of the narrative intimate a version in which Demeter's sojourn in Eleusis is integral to her recovery of her daughter. Again, I would see in this an allusive intent: *HDem* plays off the traditional version.⁶⁶ And once again, the traditional version seems to be that of the Berlin papyrus. This technique of allusion implies a detailed knowledge on the part of the (ideal) audience of whole narrative sequences of earlier poetry.

The relatively weak actorial motivation presented by the narrative of *HDem* could be regarded as a related technique of allusion. Consider first, again, the case of the *Odyssey*. In *Odyssey* XVIII–XXI, Penelope's actions are obscurely motivated, and the narrator draws attention to that fact by making Athene the motivator of Penelope's actions.⁶⁷ In particular, Penelope's 'aimless' or 'pointless' laugh (18.163 ἀχρεῖον δ' ἐγέλασσε) when Athene plants in her the resolve

⁶⁴ Apparently the standard Attic myth: cf. Isocr. 4.28; *Marm. Par. FGrH* 239 A14; Paus. 1.14.3.

⁶⁵ For a different view of the irrelevance, cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 259–60, supposing that *HDem* has imperfectly combined originally separate narrative strands; cf. N. J. Richardson 2011: 55–6.

⁶⁶ A similar position on narrative inconsistencies in *HDem* is taken by Clay 1989: 205–6, 222–5.

⁶⁷ *Od.* 18.158–62, 18.187–97, 19.479, 21.1–4. Cf. de Jong 2009b (1994): 77–9; Danek 1998a: 347.

to appear before the suitors points up the gap in actorial motivation.⁶⁸ It has been suggested that in another, 'traditional', version, evoked in this Odyssean scene, Penelope was conspiring—with Odysseus—to bring about the death of the suitors.⁶⁹ The analogous suggestion for *HDem* would be that Demeter's visit to Eleusis and her causing of the famine are traditional actions stripped of their traditional motivation; the traditional version here evoked is one in which Demeter went to Eleusis to learn about the rape of Persephone and caused the famine by descending to the underworld to bring back Persephone. In both the *Odyssey* and *HDem*, we would find familiar actions occurring in a familiar sequence, but with a drastically different actorial motivation and causation, making the narrative as a whole radically new. The 'surface' layer of narrative with its weak actorial motivation (explicitly advertised as such, in the *Odyssey*) would point to a 'deep' layer, where the actorial motivation was strong.⁷⁰

3.6 *HDem* Alludes by Inconsistency between Narrator-Text and Character-Text?

My third technique of allusion may be thought of as a special case of that just considered: inconsistency specifically between narrator-text and character-text. I begin, as usual, with an illustration from Homeric epic: the speech of the soul of the murdered suitor Amphimedon to the soul of Agamemnon in the last book of the *Odyssey* (24.121–90). This character-text is consistent with the narrator-text of the *Odyssey* except in a couple of key points: in particular, Amphimedon's soul claims Penelope's complicity in the killing of the suitors. A number of considerations point to this being a traditional version of Odysseus' homecoming.⁷¹ G. Danek has argued that 'For the listener the discrepancies between the two versions [*sc.* the narrator-text and character-text] present themselves as a citatory reference [*zitierendes Verweisen*] by the [poet] to the tradition, from which his own version is made to stand out.'⁷² The *Deuteronekyia* of book XXIV, like the *Nekyia* of book XI, seems particularly interested in exploring the *Odyssey*'s relationship with other

⁶⁸ Byre 1988: 163: 'Penelope is shown to us here at the moment when she finds herself impelled by the goddess to do something for which she herself cannot immediately see any grounds'; Lateiner 2005: 91: "pointless", that is, I think, "humanly unmotivated in the circumstances"; cf. 97; Halliwell 2008: 95 n. 104: 'under Athena's influence, Penelope cannot fully comprehend her own mood and motivation'. Cf. Scodel 1999: 152: 'either an apology for the implausibility of Penelope's action or a thematization of it'.

⁶⁹ Danek 1998a: 354; cf. Hölscher 1978: 61–2. See § 2.2.

⁷⁰ H. P. Foley 1994: 101 and n. 68 recognizes the 'gaps in motivation' as a means for the poet to 'shape audience reaction and expectation even in the case of a traditional oral narrative'. Differently, J. M. Foley 1995: 168 n. 81.

⁷¹ See § 2.2. ⁷² Danek 1998a: 484 (translated). Cf. R. B. Rutherford 1992: 36.

poetry.⁷³ In so 'metapoetic' a context, the use of a character-text to highlight the relationship between the *Odyssey* and earlier poetry on Odysseus' homecoming would not be out of place.

In this light we may consider the speech of Persephone at *HDem* 406–33: Persephone narrates to Demeter what befell her in the underworld and on the Nysian plain at the time of the rape (Hades' ruses, respectively, of the pomegranate and the narcissus). Like the speech of Amphimedon's soul in the *Odyssey*, this speech of Persephone throws up significant points of agreement and disagreement with the version of the primary narrator (*HDem* 5–21 and 334–74).⁷⁴ Some of these differences (as with Amphimedon's soul's speech) may be explained with reference to who is speaking and to whom.⁷⁵ Thus it is natural for Persephone, speaking to Demeter, to claim that she was not merely tricked, but forced into eating the pomegranate, although the narrator-text mentions only guile.⁷⁶ However, at least one difference may be explained as a 'citatory reference' to a traditional version. In the verse which rounds off the list of nymphs in attendance at the time of her rape, Persephone includes Athene and Artemis (*HDem* 424). There was no hint of either of these goddesses in the narrator-text of the rape in *HDem*, where only the daughters of Oceanus were mentioned (*HDem* 5). However, Athene and Artemis are mentioned as present at the rape in the paraphrase of the Berlin papyrus (P. Berol. 40–1). They occur, moreover, in so many other sources that their presence at the rape must be regarded as a traditional element in the Attic Demeter and Persephone myth.⁷⁷ Persephone's character-text in *HDem* thus diverges from the narrator-text of *HDem* and converges with what is to all appearances a traditional version. Once again, the narrator-text of *HDem* appears consciously to depart from tradition in its narrative of the rape.⁷⁸ And once again the traditional version appears to be reflected in the Berlin papyrus.

This neoanalytically influenced approach is, of course, only one of a number of possible approaches to the anomalous presence of the verse *HDem* 424 in

⁷³ See § 2.2, p. 53.

⁷⁴ N. J. Richardson 1974: *ad* 413; Hinds 1987: 79–80; H. P. Foley 1994: 60.

⁷⁵ Amphimedon's soul's speech: Danek 1998a: 479–81; de Jong 2001: 571–2. Compare also the discrepancies between the versions of the quarrel given by the primary narrator and by Achilles himself to Thetis, *Il.* 1.12–348 and 364–92 (J. Griffin 2004: 158: 'Achilleus naturally omits his own role in enraging the king and forcing the disastrous outcome'). Cf. Nünlist 2009: 119 with n. 16.

⁷⁶ N. J. Richardson 1974: 287.

⁷⁷ Artemis and Athene present at the rape: Eur. *Hel.* 1315–16; Diod. 5.3.4–6 (after Timaeus); Claud. *RP* 2.204–46; cf. Paus. 8.31.2 (and other references given by N. J. Richardson 1974: 290). See Graf 1974: 155–7; Bernabé 2004a: 317 (note on fr. 389.5). Traditional by at least v BC: Dale 1967: 152; Kannicht 1969: 342; N. J. Richardson 1974: 290–1.

⁷⁸ N. J. Richardson 1974: 291.

Persephone's narrative.⁷⁹ An alternative is an 'analytical' approach, which regards the verse *HDem* 424 as interpolated into *HDem* through the influence of the traditional Attic version.⁸⁰ This would parallel analytical approaches to the *Iliad* which regard certain Iliadic passages as intrusions on the ground that they included 'Cyclical' material ('Cyclical' here being taken as synonymous with post-Homeric).⁸¹ Another approach is what we might call an 'oralist' approach, according to which *HDem* 424 is a blemish resulting from the poet composing in performance and failing to exclude a traditional detail when otherwise recasting traditional material in an untraditional form: the notorious 'nod' of the oral poet.⁸² This approach would parallel that which has sometimes been taken to the duals of *Iliad* IX or Zenodotus' 'Cretan verses' in *Odyssey* I.⁸³ This 'oralist' approach substantially converges with an 'older' neoanalytical approach that explains inconsistencies as a failure of the poet to assimilate fully a new version with an old one.⁸⁴ The 'newer' neoanalytical approach propounded by Danek, which I have been following, finds evidence rather of an allusive strategy: a different kind of 'nod' to the traditional version.⁸⁵ If this is correct, the Berlin papyrus would provide once again an external textual control for *HDem* of a kind that we wholly lack for the *Odyssey*, and would provide a rare textual basis for the idea that early Greek hexameter poetry might use a character-text to 'quote' a traditional version.

'Quote' (*zitieren*) is the term used by Danek, who is chiefly interested in 'quotation' on the level of plot: non-verbatim quotation.⁸⁶ However, we may wonder whether *HDem* quotes on the level of wording: whether *HDem* 424 could be regarded as a verbatim quotation from earlier poetry. The list of nymphs at *HDem* 418–23 occurs in virtually identical form in *HDemP*Berol

⁷⁹ Compare § 2.2, p. 48.

⁸⁰ So Kannicht 1969: 342 n. 30 (after Malten); cf. Graf 1974: 154–5.

⁸¹ Kullmann 1960: 19–20 discusses this approach with reference to Bethe and Wilamowitz. A recent example of the approach is M. L. West 2001a: 12 and n. 26; cf. 2011a: 359, 412; 2011g: 412 (category of interpolation (2)).

⁸² In general, Lord 1960: 94.

⁸³ *Il.* 9.182–98; e.g. J. Griffin 1995: 102. *Od.* 1.93 and 285; e.g. Burkert 1995 = 2001; S. R. West 1988: 43.

⁸⁴ In general, J. T. Kakridis 1949: 10: 'What if here and there unassimilated points escape [the poet's] attention? We should be grateful to him for them, as otherwise it would be impossible for us to prove the extent, and above all, the nature of his dependence on his predecessors.' On *HDem*, N. J. Richardson 1974: 291: 'All these features may have been omitted in the epic narrative of the rape, leaving however a trace at this point.'

⁸⁵ See Danek 1998a: 'Index' s.v. 'konkurriende Alternativversionen'. J. M. Foley 1997a: 170–1 argues similarly against the view of a 'nodding' Homer, but from the different theoretical standpoint of traditional referentiality.

⁸⁶ Danek 1998a (the title is *Epos und Zitat*).

(P. Berol. 21–7 = fr. 387.6–10 Bernabé), and although the Berlin commentator's citation of *HDemPBerol* stops before that verse, it is possible that *HDem* 424 also occurred in *HDemPBerol*.⁸⁷ We might then wonder whether *HDem* has taken over—quoted—verses 418–24 from earlier poetry, and whether *HDemPBerol* reflects that earlier poetry.⁸⁸ That would receive some support from the fact that in *HDemPBerol* the list of nymphs in attendance on Persephone at the time of the rape came in its 'natural'⁸⁹ place in the narrative (in the narrator-text and at the start of the narrative of the rape), whereas its position in *HDem* is anything but straightforward (character-text, and postponed until very late in the poem: actorial analepsis).⁹⁰ Once again, therefore, comparison suggests that the context of the lines in *HDemPBerol* is primary and secondary in *HDem*. One could thus argue that *HDemPBerol* (P. Berol. 21–7) preserves the traditional form of the narrative of the rape, to which *HDem* alludes (418–24) by means of extensive verbatim quotation within character-text. Such an argument would parallel the earlier argument (§ 3.4) that *HDemPBerol* (P. Berol. 102–5) preserves the traditional form of Demeter's self-revelation at Eleusis, to which *HDem* alludes (54–6) by means of transferred motif and verbatim quotation.

Finally, one should note how self-conscious *HDem*'s allusive engagement with tradition is on this interpretation. *HDem* inscribes the traditional version within a character-text, and narrator-text and character-text are made to play off one another.⁹¹ The striking emphasis placed by Persephone on the veridicality of her speech, at both its beginning and its end (*HDem* 406 and 433), might also be felt to suit a poem that plays self-consciously with different versions of the same events.⁹²

⁸⁷ *HDem* 425 ἄνθεα δρέπομεν χεῖρεσσ' finds a close echo in AO 1192 ἄνθεα χερσὶ δρέπουσαν. The *Orphic Argonautica* quite likely follows an early 'Orphic' hexameter source at this point (Nelis 2005; cf. Krüger 1938: 354). If so, could that early 'Orphic' hexameter source be *HDemPBerol*? If *HDem* 418 + 420–3 + 425 were in *HDemPBerol*, there is some likelihood that *HDem* 424 also was.

⁸⁸ N. J. Richardson 1974: 63, 150 finds the language of Persephone's character-text at *HDem* 429–30 more traditional than that of the corresponding narrator-text at *HDem* 17. That might suggest that Persephone's character-text represents an earlier version than *HDem*'s narrator-text, but it would fail to show that *HDemPBerol* represents an earlier version than *HDem*, since the less traditional-seeming verse *HDem* 17 also occurs in *HDemPBerol* (P. Berol. 69).

⁸⁹ Buecheler 1907: 17.

⁹⁰ Compare the different narrative handling of the omen at Aulis at ⇒ *Il.* 2.300–32 (in actorial analepsis) and in the *Cypria*; see § 2.1, p. 41.

⁹¹ The special status of character-text, as a vehicle for traditional material the Homeric narrator-text otherwise avoids, was recognized by Aristotle (fr. 163 Rose).

⁹² Cf. N. J. Richardson 1974 on *HDem* 406, 413, 120. On 'telling the truth' and the (oral) poetic tradition, cf. M. W. Edwards 1990: 322–3; Danek 1998a: 22 ('Wahrheitsanspruch').

3.7 Self-Consciousness in *HDem*

This issue of → self-consciousness—of a poem’s awareness of its own individual standing within a tradition—deserves attention, as it has been linked directly with the question of allusion in early Greek hexameter poetry.⁹³ The *Odyssey* shows the clearest signs of such self-consciousness.⁹⁴ *HDem* shows further arguable signs of self-consciousness in addition to those already suggested.⁹⁵ First, there is the striking tendency of *HDem* to duplicate motifs. Persephone’s return occurs in two stages: from the underworld to Eleusis (*HDem* 375–89) and from Eleusis to Olympus (*HDem* 484). Two deities, other than Demeter, are involved in the return: Hermes (who brings Persephone from the underworld to Eleusis); and Rhea (who brings both Demeter and Persephone to Olympus). And there are two mother–daughter pairs, the mother in each case bringing her daughter back to Olympus: not only Demeter and Persephone, but also Rhea and Demeter. It is tempting to think that such motifs may have been employed singly in a traditional version of the Rape, and there is in fact some evidence for a traditional version in which Demeter, having descended herself into the underworld, conveyed Persephone by chariot directly from the underworld into the presence of Zeus on Olympus.⁹⁶ Such reduplication of motifs may suggest a poet self-consciously playing with motifs that an audience expected to be deployed and whose traditional form was well known to them.⁹⁷

Self-consciousness might also be seen in the fact that, as J. S. Clay has put it, ‘the poet seems to take perverse pleasure in thwarting our expectations and rendering the narrative progress problematic’.⁹⁸ We have already seen (§ 3.5) how in *HDem* traditional episodes occur without their traditional consequences ensuing. Instead of narrative progress, *HDem* gives us regress, ring composition frequently returning us at the end of an episode to its beginning.

⁹³ Cf. Burgess 2006a: 164–5: ‘we cannot be sure that performance traditions would have had the self-awareness about either themselves or other performance traditions to engage in allusive intertextuality’. On self-consciousness, cf. also R. L. Fowler 2004: 226–7.

⁹⁴ See esp. *Od.* 24.191–202, with R. B. Rutherford 2013: 79; Danek 1998a: 487; de Jong 2006: 197 and n. 26; *Od.* 9.19–20, with de Jong 2006: 197–8. Poetic self-consciousness is also to be seen in the *Odyssey*’s numerous depictions of bardic performances: Demodokos in book VIII, Odysseus in books IX–XII, and Phemios especially at *Od.* 1.325–7, 22.344–9. Cf. Mackie 1997: 77 and n. 1; Halliwell 2011: 41. Cf., too, ⇒ *Od.* 1.10. Cf. Martin 2011b (‘self-referentiality’).

⁹⁵ See Clay 1989: 202–65.

⁹⁶ Σ Pind. O.6.160c, where λέγεται suggests a traditional version.

⁹⁷ Cf. Torrance 2013: 193: ‘The motif of doubling, which is important in *Andromache*, can be read in terms of metapoetic rivalry. Aware that his version is secondary in chronological terms to Sophocles, and also to Homer, Euripides gives us “double the drama”, so to speak; cf. 191–218, on *Andromache* and *Hecuba*. In Euripides’ *Helen*, the most self-conscious of tragedians treats us to two prologues, two recognition scenes, and two supplication scenes.

⁹⁸ Clay 1989: 206.

Thus, Helios' disclosure to Demeter, far from advancing Demeter in her quest, only gives her greater 'grief' (ἄχος) than before the meetings with Hekate and Helios (*HDem* 90, echoing 40). The episode in Eleusis does not advance Demeter in her quest either, and again the end of the episode echoes its beginning (*HDem* 302–6, in ring composition with 90–2). While the reunion of Demeter and Persephone at Eleusis brings an apparent resolution to the recurrent theme of Demeter's 'grief' (*HDem* 436 ἀχέων δ' ἀπεπαύετο θυμός, harking back to both 90 ἄχος... ἵκετο θυμόν and 40 κραδίην ἄχος ἔλλαβεν), that resolution is only apparent. If a traditional ending indeed had Demeter bringing Persephone back by chariot to Zeus on Olympus, then the motif that *HDem* offers us (Hermes bringing Persephone back by chariot to Demeter at Eleusis, *HDem* 375–85) evokes that traditional ending by comparison and contrast: it is, in fact, a false ending. To convert the false ending into a real one requires the introduction of Rheia, whose role (like that of Helios) may be an innovation of *HDem*. Her involvement certainly comes as a narrative surprise; before Zeus sent Hermes to Hades, we were told he had sent 'all the gods' (325–6) to treat with Demeter: evidently Rheia was one goddess he had kept up his sleeve. Rheia's last-ditch intervention in *HDem* seems in some sense comparable to a tragic *deus ex machina*; we may think in particular of the appearance of Heracles in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* to ensure the proper outcome to the play after the playwright has teased us with several false endings. And Rheia's seemingly untraditional role in *HDem* enables an untraditional significance to be given to the 'Rarian plain': according to Attic tradition, this was the first place to be sown with cultivated seed by Triptolemos, after Demeter had instructed him in the arts of agriculture.⁹⁹ In *HDem*, its distinction is to be the place where Rheia first alights on her mission to conciliate Demeter (449–50, 457), with an explicit negation of the plain's traditional significance (450–6: the plain was *already* a φερέσβιον οἶθαρ ἀπούρης),¹⁰⁰ and perhaps also with the playful suggestion of a folk etymology contesting the traditional significance of the locality: Πάριον is here, simply, the place to which Πέη first came.¹⁰¹ Again, the traditional version is evoked while being negated.¹⁰²

A last sign of self-consciousness could be seen in Zeus' role in *HDem*. In Homeric epic gods or 'fate' may sometimes be taken as figures for either the

⁹⁹ *Mar. Par.* (FGrH 239 A13); Paus. 1.38.6.

¹⁰⁰ The fact that the agricultural yield was merely *suspended* for the period of Demeter's anger and withdrawal has been thought to make *HDem* resemble the Hittite myth of Telipinu (Graf 1974: 175–6; 2008: 683; Burkert 1977: 444). But the emphatic insistence of *HDem* on this point makes it look more like a polemical-playful departure from a traditional version than adherence to any existing version, whether Near Eastern or Greek.

¹⁰¹ The psilosis of Πάριον (Hdn. 1.546.20–1.547.3 Lentz) does not affect the viability of the folk etymology.

¹⁰² Clay 1989: 259; H. P. Foley 1994: 61–2: 'The mention of the Rarian plain... perhaps deliberately [hints] at the alternate version of the story.' In general, cf. § 2.3, pp. 63–6 (on the *Iliad*); Danek 1998a: *passim* (on the *Odyssey*).

poet or the dictates of the mythical-poetic tradition.¹⁰³ This goes also for the 'plan of Zeus'.¹⁰⁴ In *HDem* the action of the poem is from the outset signalled as coming about by the design of Zeus.¹⁰⁵ The second half of the poem, however, shows Zeus' plan getting into difficulties and Zeus struggling to get events back on course.¹⁰⁶ The end of the poem finally shows Demeter reconciled with Zeus on Olympus, and the poem thus broadly realigned with its traditional ending. This tension between Zeus' plan and the actual course taken by events in the narrative of *HDem* may be seen as a figure for the hymn's negotiation of its own relationship to the tradition.¹⁰⁷

We may speculate more at this point on the rationale of the departures of *HDem* from the traditional version. These departures are sometimes explained as a means of enhancing the Panhellenic appeal of the hymn.¹⁰⁸ Yet the hymn is far from effacing its local Attic-Eleusinian cultic colouring.¹⁰⁹ The reasons why *HDem* differs in the details of its plot from the traditional Attic version need not be fundamentally different in kind from the reasons why (say) the *Philoctetes* plays of Aeschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles differ in their plots from each other (Dio Chrysostom 52). The remarks at the end of the previous chapter (§ 2.4) concerning the impetus to innovation in the early epic tradition apply here too: no less than the Homeric epics, the Homeric hymn evidently aspires to be a 'new song' on a traditional subject of early hexameter poetry. Part of the point must consist in having events follow (largely) their traditional course, despite radically changed causation and actorial motivation (the same has been argued for the *Odyssey*: § 2.2). But the innovations of *HDem* also have implications for the characterization of its protagonists (again, like the innovations of the *Odyssey* concerning Penelope's recognition of Odysseus: § 2.2). The Demeter of the hymn appears a more isolated, self-sufficient, and majestic figure than her traditional Attic counterpart. Her visit to Eleusis is unconnected with any need for information from the Eleusinians. She is both loath to return to Olympus and stays away from the underworld. The famine is caused by a sublime act of her divine will. The absence from the main story (but not from Persephone's embedded story) of Athene and Artemis' interposition at Persephone's abduction increases the sense of isolation of both

¹⁰³ → Gods as figures for tradition; → fate as figure for tradition.

¹⁰⁴ Murnaghan 1997: 25 n. 3. Cf. § 1.1, p. 3.

¹⁰⁵ *HDem* 3 δῶκεν δὲ... Ζεὺς; 9 Διὸς βουλῇσι; 30 Διὸς ἐννεσίῃσι; 78–9 αἴτιος... Ζεὺς, / ὅς μιν ἔδωκε; 414 Κρονίδεω πυκινὴν διὰ μῆτιν.

¹⁰⁶ *HDem* 313 εἰ μὴ Ζεὺς ἐνόησεν; 334–9 (Zeus obliged to send Hermes to Hades); 441–7 (Zeus obliged to send Rheia to Demeter).

¹⁰⁷ Clay 1989: 211–13 interprets Zeus' plan differently, in cosmic terms.

¹⁰⁸ Clay 1989: 231: 'a general deemphasizing of local cult in the interest of a broader Panhellenic perspective'; cf. 10–11, 207, 268; 2011: 246; H. P. Foley 1994: 175–8.

¹⁰⁹ Parker 1991: 6–9; N. J. Richardson 2011: 50–3. More general reservations concerning the 'Panhellenism' of the *Hymns*: Chapell 2011: 66–7; Faulkner 2011: 20–2.

mother and daughter among the Olympians.¹¹⁰ The intercession of the (grand-)mother Rheia brings about a reintegration, but in a way that emphasizes the mother–daughter bond. Thus the hymn's various departures from tradition can be said to introduce new emphases and to embody a significantly new conception of the myth.¹¹¹

3.8 Conclusions

It is time to draw some conclusions. First, regarding the literary relationship of *HDem* and *HDemPBerol*. This argument builds on the recognition of other scholars that *HDem* engages allusively with its tradition on the level of plot, and on the recognition that some of its phrasing is derived from earlier poetry on the Rape of Persephone (compare *HDem* 1–3 with Hes. *Th.* 912–14). I have gone further than many scholars in suggesting that the Berlin papyrus may allow us to track the allusivity of *HDem* to a quite unexpected degree. It was argued that we may see certain common narrative structures, motifs, and not least phrases as having their primary contexts of use in *HDemPBerol* and their secondary contexts of use in *HDem*. If this identification of primary and secondary contexts is correct, then *HDemPBerol* emerges as a 'source', either direct or indirect, for *HDem*. The indeterminacy of this formulation is meant to mirror the indeterminacy found in neoanalytical scholarship over whether the *Aethiopis* is a direct or indirect source for the *Iliad*: the *Aethiopis* will be a direct source if it is earlier than the *Iliad* and is the very poem to which the *Iliad* alludes; it will be an indirect source if, though later than the *Iliad*, it reflects a specific pre-Iliadic poem (or, depending on one's theoretical standpoint, pre-Iliadic mythical tradition or non-specific pre-Iliadic poetry) to which the *Iliad* alludes.¹¹²

If *HDemPBerol* is a direct source of *HDem*, then we should expect it to emerge as primary at every point where the two may be compared; and we would expect *HDem* to be more developed linguistically than *HDemPBerol*.¹¹³ This has indeed been argued by R. Böhme, though the case is not

¹¹⁰ Hekate (*HDem* 52–63; cf. 438–40) is a sympathetic but ineffectual presence (N. J. Richardson 1974: 155 'very much a "Nebenfigur"').

¹¹¹ For a more 'Homeric' delicacy in the conception of *HDem* compared to the traditional version, see N. J. Richardson 1974: 58; H. P. Foley 1994: 178.

¹¹² J. T. Kakridis 1949: 89: 'if Homer's source is not the *Aethiopis* itself, at least it is an epic which... is to be to a great extent identified with the *Aethiopis*'; Kullmann 1960: 360–2; 1991: 428–30 = 1992: 104–5 with n. 25; Davies 1989: 5; Dowden 1996: 61; Burgess 2006a: 153. I. C. Rutherford 2012: 163–4, 166, 167 makes a similar argument about the relationship between the *Catalogue of Women* and the *Odyssey* and *Iliad*.

¹¹³ In general, Janko 1982: 226–7; Blößner 2006: 27–8 (his 'type 3b').

straightforward.¹¹⁴ Alternatively, if *HDemPBerol* were an indirect source for *HDem*, it would be possible for *HDemPBerol* to emerge as primary in some points of comparison and secondary in others: that would parallel a model that sees the *Cypria* as an indirect source for the *Iliad* (as giving us access to pre-Iliadic mythology and, possibly, to pre-Iliadic phrasing), but which sees the *Iliad* in turn as being a direct source for the *Cypria*. Some such model may be more adequate to the complexities of the data presented by P. Berol.

It will be evident that this literary analysis is insufficient to establish a relative chronology of these precise poems. While we can with a certain degree of plausibility say that the use of a motif or phraseology is primary in one context and secondary in another, it remains possible that motifs and phrases may occur in their primary contexts in poems composed later than poems that employ those motifs and phrases in secondary contexts.¹¹⁵ It is thus apparent that a relative chronology of motifs (a concern of neoanalysis as ‘motiv-geschichtliche Forschung’, the study of the history of motifs) does not equate to a relative chronology of the poems in which they occur.¹¹⁶ This is partly because conservatism and innovation are both so firmly entrenched in the early Greek hexameter tradition, and because they may coexist in combinations that are hard to fathom within a single poem.¹¹⁷

However, if this test case illustrates how difficult it may be in practice to demonstrate a direct literary dependence between a specific extant poem (*HDem* or the *Iliad*) and a specific fragmentarily preserved poem (*HDemPBerol* or the *Cypria*), the discussion suggests a conclusion of more general value: it may make excellent sense to think in terms of literary relationships between specific poems in the early Greek hexameter tradition.¹¹⁸ To think exclusively in terms of mythological intertextuality or traditional referentiality is likely to limit the possibilities of this poetic tradition unduly. If each of my techniques of allusion is accepted for *HDem*, then we must posit an ideal audience of *HDem* familiar with a version of the story of the Rape of Persephone on several different levels: knowledgeable of (and able, at least passively, to recall) an earlier version of the Rape in which (a) certain specific

¹¹⁴ Esp. Böhme 1970: 101–11 and 1983: 18. On Böhme’s assertion of the priority of Orphic poetry over Homeric, see Herrero de Jáuregui 2008: 248.

¹¹⁵ Heitsch 1978: 21: “Sekundäre” und “primäre Verwendung” sind Termini, die einen Befund beschreiben, aber keine Aussage über ein zeitliches Verhältnis enthalten; “primär” und “sekundär” bedeuten also keineswegs “früher” und “später”. Der primäre Beleg einer Junktur bei Hesiod kann durchaus später sein als der sekundäre Beleg in der *Ilias*. → Motival priority.

¹¹⁶ Neoanalysis as ‘die motivgeschichtliche Forschung zu Homer’: Kullmann 1991: 426 = 1992: 100.

¹¹⁷ A different kind of complication is contemplated by Blößner 2006: 39, from an analytical standpoint: where a relative chronology of parts of poems can be established, that does not guarantee the relative chronology of the poems as a whole.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Dowden 1996: 48. Differently, Burgess 2001: 133; 2006a: 154; Allan 2005: 14; cf. 2008: 212 n. 37; J. M. Foley† and Arft 2015: *passim*.

events occurred in a specific sequence, (b) certain specific scenes and motifs were drawn in considerable detail, and (c) certain specific hexameter verses and phrases were employed. It will be obvious that such a scenario goes beyond mythological referentiality: elaborate narrative structures are evoked and phrases or verses quoted verbatim.¹¹⁹ The interaction here is with something much more fine-grained than just a *Faktenkanon*.¹²⁰ Nor are we dealing with verses or phrases that were traditionally used to describe a particular mythological event without being anchored in any particular poem.¹²¹ Faced with evocations and quotations of whole narrative structures, of scenes, and of verses, I do not see what is gained by refusing to speak of allusion to a particular poem.¹²² For the sake of this conclusion, it makes little difference whether *HDem* is alluding to *HDemPBerol* or to another poem, many of whose features (plot, motifs, and verses) are retained in *HDemPBerol*. The argument, of course, presupposes a considerable degree of textual fixity in the early Greek hexameter tradition, though not absolute fixity: early hexameter poems might undergo small-scale changes in reperformance or textual transmission without that affecting their ability to function as the object of allusion (and verbatim quotation) for other poems (see § 1.4).

My position here may be both compared and contrasted with that of J. S. Burgess, who has posited 'oral epic traditions' whose narrative outlines and phraseology were sufficiently stable to form the basis of a 'textless intertextuality' in early epic.¹²³ It is a fundamental question when we should begin to recognize 'oral epic traditions' of such stability as a *poem*—on the understanding that a 'poem' in the early epic tradition may have a largely, but not totally, fixed textual form. Whereas Burgess thinks of *oral epic traditions* with a very high degree of fixity, I prefer to think of hexameter *poems* of less than total textual fixity. The difference is more than just terminological: to talk of poems will permit one to think in terms of individually authored compositions, and to entertain the possibility that certain poems 'stood out' from their tradition, as 'classics' in their own time and thus prime targets for later allusion.¹²⁴ By contrast, to speak of allusion to 'oral epic traditions', even ones that were remarkably fixed on the lexical level, implies an impersonal and anonymous model of allusion, on which individual poems or poets could scarcely acquire any prominence within their tradition, and where

¹¹⁹ Contrast Burgess 2006a: 154.

¹²⁰ Cf. Dowden 1996: 48, 51–5. '*Faktenkanon*': Kullmann 1960: 12–13; 2005: 9–10.

¹²¹ *Pace* Burgess 2006a: 154; cf. 2001: 154; 2012a: 168.

¹²² Compare Kullmann 1960: 369, on when it no longer makes sense to speak of 'eine fließende Epik', rather than 'ein festes Epos', as the 'Vorlage'.

¹²³ Burgess 2012a: 170.

¹²⁴ The wording here is chosen to chime with, respectively, Taplin 1990: 111 and Burkert 1979: 57 = 2001: 192–3.

interaction remains on a *parole-to-langue* level, rather than *parole-to-parole* (see Chapter 6).

Throughout this chapter I have argued for a reading of *HDem* that parallels certain well-known neoanalytical readings of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Those neoanalytical readings have provided interpretative paradigms by which to understand the literary relationships between the two archaic *Hymns to Demeter*. In turn, the two archaic *Hymns to Demeter* give these neoanalytical readings a textual footing which they otherwise lack. So circular an approach does not of course prove the legitimacy of such readings of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. But it does suggest the viability of extending these neoanalytical readings to other early hexameter texts.¹²⁵ If a theory's value resides in part in how well (how comprehensively and how attractively) it enables one to make sense of the available data, then these perspectives on neoanalysis from the archaic *Hymns to Demeter* have a serious claim on our attention. If we accept that the real difficulty with allusion or intertextuality in early Greek hexameter poetry is not one of theory but of evidence,¹²⁶ then we ought not to ignore the data offered by *HDemPBerol* and *HDem*, its considerable complexities notwithstanding.¹²⁷ Nor should it be thought very strange that the critical issues surrounding Homeric neoanalysis are seen to replicate themselves in miniature with *HDem*. W. Burkert once observed that the critical issues in Homeric analysis are played out, on a small scale, in the 'Homeric' *Hymn to Apollo*.¹²⁸ In a different but complementary way Bernabé's decision to edit the Orphic fragments in volume two of *Poetae epici Graeci* alongside the fragments of the Epic Cycle in volume one invites us to expand the repertoire of early Greek hexameter material to which neoanalytical approaches may be applicable.

I am conscious of having based some large conclusions on controversial texts and controversial methodologies; it seems appropriate therefore to end by reviewing the problems. First, the problems surrounding the Berlin papyrus cannot be minimized; in particular, the 'first-order questions' that dominated the first part of my analysis lack a decisive resolution. I have assumed that not all the verses in P. Berol. have been generated by *HDem*, but in at least some cases (P. Berol. 102–5 ~ *HDem* 54–6, perhaps P. Berol. 21–7 ~ *HDem* 418–23) are older than *HDem* and are alluded to by *HDem*. Second, it is legitimate to doubt how transferable conclusions drawn from the archaic Attic *Hymns to*

¹²⁵ This extension itself has interesting implications: motif transference and intertextuality will not just be Homeric. Differently, Burgess 2006a: 161, 164.

¹²⁶ Dowden 1996: 48.

¹²⁷ About 26 verses of *HDemPBerol* are preserved, and the complete *HDemPBerol* can hardly have totaled more than a couple of hundred verses (*HDem* totals 495 verses). Contrast the *Cypria*, of which some 50 verses are preserved out of an original 11 books (totaling some 5,500 verses, on a conservative estimate).

¹²⁸ Burkert 1979: 53 = 2001: 189.

Demeter may be to the Homeric epics. In the first place, the *Hymns to Demeter* may have had a quite restricted circulation: circumscribed temporally, geographically, and contextually (if all are products of sixth-century Attica and performed in the context of mystery cults).¹²⁹ So selective a public may have created optimal conditions for allusion between poems, especially such short poems.¹³⁰ In general, the case for specific allusion seems especially strong with the *Hymns*.¹³¹ There is also a question of (relative) orality:¹³² one might suppose that the poets of the (sixth-century) hymns worked with written texts in a way that the (eighth- or seventh-century) poet(s) of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* did not.¹³³ However, an extreme contrast between the Homeric epics and the hymns along these lines is not attractive. Probably we should think of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as existing in written form at the moment of their conception.¹³⁴ Moreover, the archaic hymns were oral in the sense that is most crucial for our purposes, that they were performed to audiences who (for the most part) can hardly have known them in any other way.¹³⁵ Proper though it is to ponder the cultural differences that a century or so may have brought, it is proper also to recognize that we must have here some of the closest comparative evidence available to us for Homeric epic.

¹²⁹ Poetry performed in the context of mystery cults: Obbink 2013.

¹³⁰ Cf., on Attic drama, Revermann 2006: 104, 114: 'expertise by exposure.'

¹³¹ O. Thomas 2011: 168; cf. Janko 1982: 225–6; M. L. West 2003c: 5; Olson 2012, esp. 16, 279.

¹³² On this question, see Janko 1982: 18–41; Cantilena 1982, esp. 29.

¹³³ See esp. Janko 2012: 33; cf. 1982: 78.

¹³⁴ Cf. A. Parry 1989 (1966); J. M. Foley 1997a: 163.

¹³⁵ Cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 338.

Pregnant Tears and Poetic Memory

4.1 Neoanalysis and ‘Pregnant Tears’

At the heart of this chapter is an observation about three Iliadic scenes that have all featured in neoanalytical scholarship (the meeting of Hektor and Andromache in book VI, Thetis and the Nereids grieving with Achilleus in book XVIII, and Antilochos learning of Patroklos’ death in book XVII): that the characters in each scene react to the action by shedding tears in an unusually suggestive way. Two passages of the *Odyssey* that fall outside the scope of regular neoanalysis will also be considered, where characters react to the action by shedding tears in a similarly pregnant way: Eurykleia’s washing of Odysseus’ feet in book XIX and Eumaios’ welcoming of Telemachos at the beginning of book XVI. The argument of the chapter is that Homer—the poet(s) of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—is able to exploit characters’ emotional responses, above all tears, as means of drawing attention to the use that he is making of the mythological or poetic tradition. The suggestion is that there is a phenomenon of ‘pregnant tears’ which may in some contexts be powerfully allusive, and that attending to the phenomenon helps us to appreciate Homer’s allusive art. A number of different but related concepts are brought into play: symbolic scenes and objects, allusion to earlier poetry (or mythology?), metalepsis, irony, and poetic memory. As the interrelationship of these is not self-evident, the following is offered as a preliminary orientation.

First, tears are often ambivalent. We may weep for something different from what we seem to others, or even from what we understand ourselves, to be weeping for; and we may weep for reasons that our own consciousness does not fully apprehend. The fact that tears can have more than one level of significance makes their presence natural in symbolic scenes, scenes which signify on more than one level.¹ In literature, prominently placed tears can encourage us to look for more than one level of meaning.

¹ Symbolic Homeric scenes: J. Griffin 1980a: 1–49; M. W. Edwards 1987a: 114–16.

Second, symbolism, allusion, and ambivalent tears work in similar ways and are very compatible with one another.² All are relational concepts in the sense that they relate one entity to another: *x* symbolizes *y*; *x* alludes to *y*; tears shed for *x* are also (or really) shed for *y*. Symbolism, allusion, and ambivalent tears are thus capable of working together to produce complex and powerful effects. We will shortly be interested in cases where all three operations appear to act at once.

Third, tears, as an often non-rational, and certainly non-verbal, response by a character to a situation, can point up the discrepancy between what a character consciously knows and what he or she may vaguely intuit about his or her situation in the poem or in the poetic tradition at large. This discrepancy between a character's conscious knowledge and vague intuition may converge with the discrepancy between character knowledge and audience knowledge; hence tears may work alongside 'dramatic irony'.

Fourth, such tears may also indicate a blurring of the world of the character and the world of the audience: in narratological terminology, 'metalepsis'. In particular, such tears may involve a confusion of, or a play with, the character's and audience's memories of the past. Allusively 'pregnant' tears may in this way involve effects close to those of 'poetic memory'.

4.2 Homeric Tears

In general, tears in Homer have received less attention than laughter.³ Dedicated studies have tended to take cultural, sociological, or anthropological points of view.⁴ We shall be interested in their poetical uses.⁵ The uses of tears in literature may of course reflect the uses of tears in life, but tears in literature may also have distinctly literary functions. Our starting point is the well-known fact that in Homer characters may weep ostensibly for one thing, but really for another.⁶ So, famously, Briseis and the slave-women in *Iliad* XIX: 'So

² Cf. Lateiner 2011a, for the natural relationship between 'body language', such as weeping, and 'communicative objects', i.e. symbolic objects.

³ Homeric laughter: Lateiner 2005; 2011b; Halliwell 2008: 51–99. Non-verbal behaviour in Homer: Lateiner 1995.

⁴ Monsacré 1984: esp. 137–201; Arnould 1990; Jäkel 1994; van Wees 1998: 11–16; Cairns 2009; Föllinger 2009; Lateiner 2011c. Noteworthy comments on specific passages: Σ bT II. 1.349, 19.282–302, *alias*; S. R. West 1988: 136; Hoekstra 1989: 274; Hainsworth 1993: 60–1; J. Griffin 1995: 77.

⁵ Cf. Perkell 2008: 94–5, 108. Poetical uses of *laughter*: Lateiner 1977: 174, 180–2.

⁶ J. Griffin 1980a: 27–8; cf. 67–9. Cf. Podlecki 1971: 86; D. L. Cairns 2009: 44, on *Od.* 8.523–30. Not just in Homer: cf. Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.3; Philostr. *Her.* 26.12; Leo Tolstoy, *War and Peace*, book 1, part 1, ch. 14: 'Anna Mikhailovna was already embracing her and weeping. The countess wept too. They wept because they were friends, and because they were kind-hearted, and because they—friends from childhood—had to think about such a base thing as money, and because their youth was over' (trans. L. and A. Maude).

she spoke, weeping; and the women added their lamentation—for Patroklos ostensibly, but each for her own woes' (301–2).⁷ In *Iliad* XXIV, Priamos weeps for Hektor and his other dead sons, while Achilles weeps for Peleus (509–12).⁸ In *Odyssey* IV, Helene, Telemachos, and Menelaos weep for Odysseus' lost homecoming; Peisistratos weeps simultaneously for Antilochos' lost homecoming (183–9). To these relatively simple examples of weeping for something other than that which is immediately present in the narrative may be added more complex examples, where variously directed weeping is joined by foreshadowing and symbolism. At *Iliad* 22.410–11, after the death of Hektor, the lament is raised in Troy 'as if Troy itself was being burned to the ground'. That statement builds on a symbolic identification of Hektor, Troy's bulwark, with Troy itself, an identification established early in the poem.⁹ It is obvious here how symbolism, whereby one thing stands for another, may work in conjunction with a motif of weeping ostensibly for one thing, really for another.

In the five examples I am going to discuss, another scene or situation is implicit in the actual scene or situation that is narrated. The scenes are allusive: they have a less obvious → connotative as well as a more obvious denotative dimension. The character's tears, by way of expressing a surplus of emotion, exceeding what the situation seems immediately to warrant, help to orient the audience away from the present scene towards that other, implicit, scene. In this sense tears may be considered an ancillary technique of allusion. In nearly all the scenes symbolism works in conjunction with the tears. It is an open question, which calls for careful consideration, whether the scene that is alluded to has any existence independent of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* in either traditional mythology or earlier poetry (compare § 1.6).

4.3 Example One: *Iliad* 6.369–502 (the *Homilia*)

In *Iliad* VI, as he is about to leave Troy for the field of battle, Hektor in full armour encounters his wife accompanied by their child and his nurse (369–502). The first thing to note is the symbolism of the scene.¹⁰ There is a powerful ambivalence in the image of the armed warrior among his family, a tension between the military and the domestic spheres. On the one hand, Hektor is the defender of his family against the external threat; on the other hand, Hektor's heroism puts his own life into jeopardy and endangers the

⁷ Cf. *Il.* 19.338–9. Imitated by Q.S. 10.407–10.

⁸ Cf. *Il.* 24.161–8.

⁹ 'Hektor' in *figura etymologica* as 'he who upholds the city': *Il.* 5.472–4; cf. 6.403; Duckworth 1933: 30; Scully 1990: 58–61.

¹⁰ M. W. Edwards 1987a: 211. Schadewaldt 1965 (1935): 222 = 1997: 136 denies the presence of symbolism in the scene.

family.¹¹ In J. M. Redfield's words: 'In the conversation between Hector and Andromache the poet dramatizes the pain of the warrior's role, of the man who, on behalf of his family, must leave his family, so that his very defense of them becomes a betrayal.'¹² The warrior's armour becomes an ambivalent symbol. On the one hand, it betokens the warrior's prowess and his protection in battle.¹³ On the other hand, its donning signals the removal of the family man from the domestic into the military sphere and the capacity for the military world to shatter the domestic. The scene of the 'warrior's departure' is a favourite with archaic and classical artists on vases and gravestones; and in these representations, too, the warrior's departure is an ambiguous symbol. Of the motif as it is employed on Attic white-ground lekythoi, J. H. Oakley has said: 'Departure is exactly what the dead do, making these pictures a metaphorical equivalent of death—a double passage—one very appropriate for grave lekythoi and containing a very patriotic message as well.'¹⁴ One lekythos comes particularly close to *Iliad* VI; Oakley comments: 'the mother holds a swaddled infant. This makes the bearded warrior's departure even more poignant, as one senses already the loss to be endured by the wife and child.'¹⁵ We need not be detained by the question whether the artists are influenced by Homer, or whether either are influenced by a topos of life, literature, or art; it is important rather to recognize that the Iliadic scene has its own 'iconography', and makes its own use of significant, symbolic objects.

The second thing to note is Andromache's tears.¹⁶ Andromache weeps throughout this scene: 'wailing and lamenting' (373), 'Andromache stood near by him, shedding tears' (405), 'laughing tearfully' (484),¹⁷ 'his dear wife went off home, turning round frequently, shedding abundant tears' (496). No less than the image of the armed warrior, these tears are ambivalent. On the one hand, they are the natural tears of the wife distraught at the danger her husband is about to face on the battlefield. On the other hand, and decidedly less naturally, Andromache mourns Hektor as if he were already dead.¹⁸ This is implicit at the beginning of the scene: 'wailing and lamenting' (373).¹⁹ It is

¹¹ Cf. *Il.* 6.407–9. Lohmann 1988: 41–3, for Hektor's 'Rollenambivalenz' as 'Zerstörer und Erhalter der Familie'.

¹² Redfield 1975: 123. Cf. J. Griffin 1980a: 7; Schein 1984: 174.

¹³ J. Griffin 1980a: 7–8, 36.

¹⁴ Oakley 2005: 57.

¹⁵ Oakley 2005: 62 (on Fig. 39). Herter 1973: 160–4 emphasizes the inability of visual depictions to capture the effects of Homer's scene.

¹⁶ Arnould 1990: 81–2.

¹⁷ Halliwell 2008: 54; Konstan 2009: 313–14.

¹⁸ Cf. Reichel 1994: 184. Schadewaldt 1965 (1935): 214–15 = 1997: 130 emphasizes how the thought of Hektor's death dominates the scene from lines 367–8 on, and becomes increasingly concrete in the course of the scene.

¹⁹ Stoevestand 2008: 124: 'Beide Wörter (*goáō* und *mýromai*) stehen in der *Ilias* meist mit Bezug auf Totenklagen ...: Andromache antizipiert Hektors nahen Tod.'

explicit at the end: 'They [Andromache and her maidservants] bewailed Hektor, still alive, in his own home; they did not think that he would again come,'²⁰ returning from battle, fleeing the might and the hands of the Achaeans' (500–2). We should distinguish between tears of anxiety at an outcome that is merely feared and tears of grief at an outcome that is already accomplished. Here the distinction is suggestively collapsed: Hektor's death is not merely anxiously anticipated, it is actually lamented.²¹ Andromache's tears work in conjunction with the symbolism of the scene of the warrior's departure; their ambivalence is mutually reinforcing. There is an insistent connotation of Hektor's death behind the surface denotation of the narrative. The fact that it is made explicit (500–2) does not diminish our entitlement to speak of a symbolic connotation.²²

The scene also involves foreshadowing, or a symbolic internal prolepsis: the tears point forward to other passages in the poem, Andromache's laments in book XXII and book XXIV.²³ We might say that there are 'intratextual' links on a verbal level between books VI and XXII. Andromache is found 'lamenting' (γοόωσα) in both book VI and book XXII.²⁴ She is 'like a madwoman' in both book VI and book XXII 2 (6.389 *μαινομένη ἐκινῶ*, 22.460 *μαινάδι ἴση*).²⁵ In place of the term 'foreshadowing' one could say, usurping a term from discussion of similes, that Andromache's tears and frenzied lamentation have 'trespassed' on the scene in book VI from the scenes in books XXII and XXIV.²⁶ Or using the term of art of neoanalytical scholarship, we might say

²⁰ Schadewaldt 1965 (1935): 227–8 = 1997: 141: 'Die Begegnung mit Andromache ist das "letzte" Zusammensein der Gatten. Ein aufmerksamer Leser kann herausrechnen, daß Hektor noch einmal nach Troja kommt (7.310) und vermutlich auch Andromache wiedergesehen haben wird. Aber das bleibt für den Dichter belanglos, denn er *zeigt* die Gatten nicht mehr beieinander.' Cf. Herter 1973: 159; Taplin 1992: 125; Reichel 1994: 183–4.

²¹ Similar but also different is the behaviour of Priamos at *Il.* 22.33–4, 77–8: his gestures too evoke mourning ritual (N. J. Richardson 1993: 109, 114; de Jong 2012: 67), but Hektor's death is there decidedly more imminent. Cf. also Ps.-Hes. *Sc.* 242–4.

²² Symbolic connotations made explicit: e.g. *Il.* 22.410–11; *Nibelungenlied* 70.1–4; Charles Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities*, book 1, chapter v: 'The wine was red wine, and had stained the ground of the narrow street ... It had stained many hands, too, ... one tall joker ... scrawled upon the wall with his finger dipped in muddy wine-lees—BLOOD. The time was to come, when that wine too would be spilled on the street stones, and when the stain of it would be red upon many there.'

²³ Kirk 1990: 225; Schadewaldt 1965 (1935): 227–8 = 1997: 141; Segal 1971: 39–40; Lohmann 1988: 63–74; Taplin 1992: 126; Stoevestand 2008: 155; de Jong 2012: 11–12; R. B. Rutherford 2012b: 18–19.

²⁴ Segal 1971: 52.

²⁵ Note also 6.407 *τὸ σὸν μένος* ~ 22.459 *τὸ ὄν μένος*. Segal 1971 discusses these and other possible 'echoes'; cf. Tsagalis 2008: 9–10.

²⁶ For 'trespass' (the appearance in the vehicle of language proper to the tenor of a simile), see Lyne 1989: 73, 92–9. Cf. Silk 1974: 138–49: 'intrusion'. As Garner 1990: 5 points out, '[t]he models for the elements and workings of metaphor apply equally well to allusion. The primary text will be the tenor; the text it alludes to, the vehicle; whatever the two texts share in common is the ground.' See further § 4.8, p. 135.

that they have been 'transferred' from the later to the earlier.²⁷ To employ such language is to recognize that the latter scene is the proper, or motivally prior, narrative context for these tears.

This kind of thing, tears at a warrior's departure foreshadowing the warrior's death, is of course common in epic (sometimes with *suggestio falsi*: the warrior does not die).²⁸ In the third book of the Standard Babylonian version of *Gilgamesh*, Ninsun is overcome by sadness at Gilgamesh's declaration of his intent to set out on the fateful expedition to the cedar forest to do battle with its guardian Humbaba (35 *maršiš ištenemme*, 'she listened mournfully').²⁹ In Avdo Međedović's *Marriage of Vlahinjić Alija*, Alija's mother weeps, intuiting the impending danger before she hears of the circumstances that will take Alija to Klis to woo Zlata (606–13).³⁰ In book VIII of the *Aeneid*, Evander swoons at Pallas' departure for battle (584); Evander's actual lament over the dead Pallas is narrated in book XI (148–81).³¹ Early in the *Chanson de Roland*, Charlemagne and the Franks repeatedly weep tears of foreboding for Roland, weeping for him as if he were (as good as) dead (823–5, 841–3, 1404, 1814–15); later, Charlemagne weeps tears at Roland's actual death (2414–22). The *Nibelungenlied* has numerous examples of often explicit foreshadowing of a hero's death through tears at his departure.³² Siegfried's father and mother and the young women of Xanten weep for Siegfried at his departure from home (here the primary narrator includes an explicit prolepsis of his death, 69–70). Kriemhild weeps for Siegfried as he leaves for the fatal hunt (920–1). And prophetic-proleptic tears are shed at Rüdiger's departure from Bechelaren (1711.3–4). These lines are preceded by an explicit prolepsis of the death of all of Rüdiger's company and of the tears that would then be shed (1709.4, 1710.4). Proleptic grieving is also at home in the modern novel: in chapter xvii of Henry James' *The American*, Madame de Cintré weeps at the ostensibly casual leave-taking of her brother Valentin, intuiting some impending disaster; his death of a duelling wound is narrated in chapters xix–xx. In all these works, characters' tears function as a sophisticated device enabling the narrative to reflect on its own development.

Proleptic tears, of course, may occur at the beginning of any episode which is to have disastrous consequences, not just a hero's departure.

²⁷ → Motif transference.

²⁸ *Il.* 24.327–8. A.R. 1.247–305; cf. 3.460–1. Deidameia and Neoptolemos, Q.S. 7.253–91, 315–45, 384–93. Cf. Q.S. 9.113–14. Little is known of the 'Departure of Amphiaraios', *Ἀμφιαράου ἐξέλασις*, an important scene in early Greek epic and art (*Thebais Testimonia* 7–8 Bernabé; Gantz 1993: 507–8; Braswell 1998: 30).

²⁹ Weeping in *Gilgamesh*: Tigay 1982: 9 n. 29. Foreshadowing in *Gilgamesh*: Reichel 1994: 344.

³⁰ German translation: Danek 2002a: 63–4.

³¹ Note also Virg. *Aen.* 8.583: *digressu... supremo*, 'at [Pallas'] final departure'; 592 *stant pavidae in muris matres*, 'the mothers stand fearful on the walls', picked up at 11.146–7 *quae postquam matres succedere tectis / uiderunt, maestam incendunt clamoribus urbem*. Duckworth 1933: 58–9; Gransden 1976: 156.

³² Reichel 1994: 352.

Odysseus' *Apologue* furnishes several examples.³³ In the first two misadventures Odysseus' men lament only after the fact (*Od.* 9.64–6, 467: Kikones, Kyklopes). But in subsequent misadventures they weep in advance of, as well as subsequent to, their actual suffering, with Kirke (beforehand: 10.201, 209; afterwards: 241, 246–8, 398–9, 409, 454) and with Skylla (beforehand: 12.234; afterwards: 309–11). The descent to the underworld, although it is without fatal consequences, also occasions anticipatory weeping (10.497–9, 576–8, 11.5). Historiography, a literary heir of Homeric epic, also employs proleptic tears. Herodotus' Xerxes, reviewing his forces on the passage to Greece, has a general presentiment of human transience and sheds proleptic tears (7.45). Further into the campaign, an unnamed Persian at a banquet in Thebes has a more specific premonition of the impending Persian disaster, and weeps proleptically (9.16.3). After the actual defeat at Salamis, Susa is plunged into real mourning (8.99.2). As tears in Homer may serve a poetical purpose, so do these tears underscore a historiographical point: they create links between scenes, bring one scene into another, and intimate relationships between causally connected events.³⁴ Polybius has Scipio Aemilianus weep at the sack of Carthage: the spectacle of this great city's destruction is a foreshadowing of a future sacking of Rome itself (Polyb. 38.21; compare App. *Pun.* 132 (628–30), Diod. 32.24).³⁵

These examples must suffice to show that proleptic tears are a widespread 'literary' device. ('Literary' here does not mean 'written': they are also found in Bosnian and Serbian heroic song.)³⁶ In Homer they may reasonably be called a 'recurring motif'.³⁷ This is emphatically not to say that they are a 'type-scene', either in Homer or in Greek epic more widely.³⁸ Type-scenes facilitate narration and advance the action of the poem; they are valuable for their compositional utility. By contrast, these scenes of weeping conduce to complex effects at a level beyond the straightforwardly narrative. Tears of this kind should be regarded as a 'literary' technique (of connotation, of intra- or intertextual allusion), rather than a type-scene.

We return to Andromache's tears. These point us beyond the purely denotative level of the narrative. The tears explicitly seem (even to the characters themselves) excessive, more than the immediate situation warrants. Hektor says to Andromache, 'Crazy one, don't, please, grieve too much (λίγν) in your

³³ Arnould 1990: 23.

³⁴ Laughter has comparable historiographical uses: Lateiner 1977; Flory 1978.

³⁵ Henrichs 1995: 250–3.

³⁶ Bosnian heroic song: Avdo Međedović, *Marriage of Vlahinjić Alija* 606–13. Serbian heroic song: Filip Višnjić *The Death of Marko Kraljević* (Karadžić 1841–62: ii no. 74 ll. 5–24, 67, 147–8 = Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 209–10, 211, 214): firstly, proleptic tears of Šarac and Marko, before the latter's death; secondly, of Vaso, after Marko's death.

³⁷ Stoevesandt 2008: 155–6 'ein wiederkehrendes Motiv'; cf. Arnould 1990: 187–9 'déplorations anticipées'.

³⁸ See Appendix E.

heart' (486).³⁹ The frightened reaction of Astyanax later in the scene is seen by his parents as humorously inappropriate (471). The intensity of the characters' emotions imbues the scene with special importance, more than it would otherwise be felt to have. The pregnancy of these tears creates something like the → 'interpretative gap' or 'tension' in the narrative that is associated with metaphor and allusion.⁴⁰ Because the tears seem more than the immediate situation warrants, they point the audience to another situation that is implicit in the actual narrative situation: a situation in which Andromache is already widowed and Astyanax is defenceless against Troy's aggressors.

Such a situation actually features in early Greek epic. Neoanalytical scholars have long compared this scene with one from the *Little Iliad* (fr. 21.1–5 Bernabé):

αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαθύμου φαίδιμος υἱὸς
ἔκτορέην ἄλοχον κάταγεν κούλας ἐπὶ νῆας.
παῖδα δ' ἑλὼν ἐκ κόλπου ἐϋπλοκάμοιο τιθήνης
ῥῆψε ποδὸς τεταγῶν ἀπὸ πύργου, τὸν δὲ πεσόντα
ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή.

The brilliant son of great-hearted Achilleus
led down Hektor's wife towards the hollow ships;
and taking their son from the bosom of his well-tressed nurse,
he swung him by the foot and cast him from the tower; he fell and
crimson death took him, and violent fate.

The fragment describes a scene after the sack of Troy.⁴¹ These events tally closely with what Hektor fears for Andromache at *Il.* 6.454–65, as well as with what Andromache fears for Astyanax at 24.735. The relationship between this fragment and the *Iliad* is vexed.⁴² The fate of being thrown to one's death from the city walls seems to have been an unusual one, and Astyanax may even have been unique in early Greek epic in meeting his death thus.⁴³ The *Iliad* has been argued to depend on a scene from earlier epic poetry like the one in the *Little Iliad* and, conversely, the scene of the *Little Iliad* has been argued to depend on the two *Iliadic* scenes.⁴⁴ We may take it, on the former scenario, that

³⁹ On *δαμονή* here, see Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 220.

⁴⁰ See Garner 1990: 5, quoted in full in § 4.8, p. 135.

⁴¹ Cf. Q.S. 13.251–90. The detail of Astyanax being hurled from the wall is variously ascribed to 'the Cyclical poet who composed the [*Iliou persis*]' (*Σ' Eur. Andr.* 10 = *Iliou persis* fr. 5 Bernabé), to 'the post-Homeric poets' (Eustath. on *Il.* 24.732–5 = iv.979.46–7 van der Valk), and to 'Lescheos' *Iliou persis*' [*sic*] (Paus. 10.25.9; cf. M. L. West 2013: 212–13).

⁴² M. J. Anderson 1997: 55–6.

⁴³ Priamos uses vaguely generalizing plurals at *Il.* 22.63–4: καὶ νήπια τέκνα | βαλλόμενα προσιγαίῃ ἐν αἰνῇ δημότητι, but Eustathius *ad loc.* (iv.571.23–6 van der Valk) thinks only of Astyanax, as do Le Meur-Weissmann 2008–9: 41 and Burgess 2010: 217–18.

⁴⁴ The former: Macleod 1982: 151; Burgess 2001: 66 and 215 n. 67; 2010: 215; 2012a: 176–82; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 7, 213. The latter: *Σ' A Il.* 24.735a; Kullmann 1960: 186–7, 353; 1968: 31 n. 39 = 1992: 236 n. 39; N. J. Richardson 1993: 354–5.

Astyanax's death will have been narrated more fulsomely in that putative earlier poetry than in the exceptionally spare narrative of the *Little Iliad*. (Even a very brief reference by Pausanias, 10.25.9, to the death of Astyanax in 'Lescheos' *Iliou Persis*' supplies a detail missing from our fragment: that it was through Neoptolemos' own personal desire, not a decree of the Greeks, that Astyanax was killed.)⁴⁵

We have already identified a strong connotative dimension to the *Iliad* VI passage: the symbolism and the tears point to another situation, one in fact very like that presupposed in the fragment of the *Little Iliad*. There are thus grounds for seeing the scene in the *Little Iliad* as motivally prior to that of the *Iliad*. If so, we could see the scene of *Iliad* VI as evoking the scene described in the *Little Iliad* in some detail. Andromache and Hektor meet at the city tower or wall (πύργον, τεῖχος: *Il.* 6.373, 386, 388), the very place from where Neoptolemos in the fragment of the *Little Iliad* hurls Astyanax to his death (fr. 21.4 Bernabé ἀπὸ πύργου).⁴⁶ The nurse too is there in Homer, holding Astyanax at her bosom (*Il.* 6.372, 389, 399–400, 467–8). Even the armed warrior is there, in the form of Hektor himself, reaching out to take Astyanax from the nurse. The helmeted Hektor in the *Iliadic* scene is visually indistinguishable from the hostile Greek warrior⁴⁷ who dashes Astyanax to his death.⁴⁸ If we accept an allusion to earlier poetry—or to traditional mythology—by means of which the armed Hektor of the *Iliad* connotes the traditional Greek killer of Astyanax, then the ambivalent symbolism discussed earlier acquires even greater poignancy. The image of Hektor in arms would represent a threat to his own family not just in the generic sense that all departing warriors do (as on the white-ground lekythoi), but in a further quite specific sense, which depends on the detection of an allusive rapport between Homer's scene and an independently existing scene from traditional mythology or earlier poetry.⁴⁹

On the neoanalytical view, Andromache's tears may be seen as trespassing on the scene of *Iliad* VI from an external mythological or poetic episode; they

⁴⁵ The → condensed style of the *Little Iliad*'s narrative: Bravo 2001: 73–89, esp. 74, 77; M. J. Anderson 1997: 54, 55; M. L. West 2013: 168, 170, 220. Compressed narrative style as a feature of chronological, inclusive epics (see Appendix C): Burgess 2001: 145–6. Homer's ability also to compose in this more traditional, expansion-free style: Kirk 1962: 164–6; M. L. West 1981: 56–7 = 2011b: 149; M. W. Edwards 1987a: 76; Scodel 2002: 124; Danek 2011: 301 (mythological exempla). Likewise, of *Beowulf*: Stanley 1987: 293–5; of Avdo Međedović: Danek 2012b: 38, 40–1; of Mehmed Kolaković: Danek 2002a: 295 n. 360 (typical for Serbian heroic song: Danek *ibid.* 335).

⁴⁶ It is also the place where Hektor will meet his end (*Il.* 22.447, 462). Kirk 1990: 208: 'a place of ill omen'; Burgess 2010: 216–19.

⁴⁷ It matters little for our purposes that the *Iliou persis* made Odysseus Astyanax's killer: Summary, Bernabé p. 89 lines 20–1. M. J. Anderson 1997: 53; Burgess 2010: 213. M. L. West 2013: 226 assigns priority to the version of the *Little Iliad*.

⁴⁸ M. J. Anderson 1997: 58; Burgess 2012a: 178–9. Neoptolemos is φαίδυμος at *Little Iliad* fr. 21.1 Bernabé, as is Hektor in the *Iliad*: Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 214.

⁴⁹ Cf. Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 25–6 and nn. 77–8.

have been transferred to *Iliad* VI from elsewhere. It is even conceivable that there may be intertextual verbatim quotation, further to the intratextual verbatim quotation between book VI and books XXII and XXIV. That argument is suggested by Andromache's lament in book XXIV, where 735 | ῥίψει χειρὸς ἐλὼν ἀπὸ πύργου resembles *Little Iliad* fr. 21.4 Bernabé | ῥίψε ποδὸς τεταγὼν ἀπὸ πύργου; and by the description of Astyanax's shrinking from his father in line 467 of book VI, ἄψ δ' ὁ παῖς πρὸς κόλπον ἐϋζώνοιο τιθήνης (sc. ἐκλίνθη), which resembles *Little Iliad* fr. 21.3 Bernabé παιῖδα δ' ἐλὼν ἐκ κόλπου ἐϋπλοκάμοιο τιθήνης.⁵⁰ Such verbatim quotation would entail that the *Iliad* is interacting with existing poetry, not just mythology. It is possible, of course, that the *Little Iliad* (as the → motivally prior version, but the later text) has been influenced by the *Iliad* on the level of phrasing. But the scenario that this poem presents a → cento of divers modified Iliadic passages (*Il.* 1.591 | ῥίψε ποδὸς τεταγὼν combined with 24.735 | ῥίψει χειρὸς ἐλὼν ἀπὸ πύργου and 6.467 κόλπον ἐϋζώνοιο τιθήνης) is not more likely than the scenario that it reflects a pre-Homeric account of Astyanax's death with which the *Iliad* interacts, also on the level of wording.⁵¹

Symbolism, foreshadowing combined with intratextual verbatim quotation, and allusion combined with intertextual verbatim quotation would all coexist in this scene; they would all be complementary and mutually reinforcing. All would point to a connotative dimension in the narrative: the death of Hektor, the devastation of his family. Andromache's tears are part of that connotative dimension of the narrative. There are different ways of describing the poetic effects of these tears; one is dramatic irony.⁵² What Andromache fears and weeps for the audience knows will happen. The interplay between Andromache's forebodings and the audience's knowledge of what will happen is of course a powerful source of pathos.⁵³ There is in books XXII and XXIV a clear contrast between Andromache's ignorance and the audience's knowledge. In book XXII, Andromache is the last to hear of Hektor's death (437–9): weaving clothes he will never wear, preparing a bath he will never take (440–6, 510–14).⁵⁴ In book XXIV, lamenting for Hektor, she is made to anticipate exactly what will befall Astyanax, in tones of

⁵⁰ Burgess 2012a: 177–82; cf. 2001: 154. Differently, the *Little Iliad* as 'reworking the language of the *Iliad*': Kelly 2015b: 338; cf. N. J. Richardson 1993: 354. The variation ποδὸς τεταγὼν and χειρὸς ἐλὼν may be explained by the different metrical shape of the aorist and future forms ῥίψε and ῥίψει (M. J. Anderson 1997: 55).

⁵¹ Contrast the positions of N. J. Richardson 1993: 354 and Burgess 2001: 154; 2012a: 177–8. Compare the discussion under § 5.7.

⁵² Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 7–8. In general, M. W. Edwards 1987a: 33; R. B. Rutherford 2012a: 323–9. There is a 'tragic' quality to Andromache's ignorance and knowledge (*anagnorisis*): Segal 1971: 36–7, 56; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 26.

⁵³ Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 7.

⁵⁴ Segal 1971: 36; J. Griffin 1980a: 109–10; Di Benedetto 1994: 31; Grethlein 2007: 27–8; de Jong 2012: 173.

epistemological uncertainty: 'I *do not think* that he will come of age'; 'either you will follow me onto the ships...or *someone* of the Achaeans will take hold of you by the hand and throw you from the tower' (732–8).⁵⁵ Similarly when Achilles speaks of his own death to Lykaon, the second of the two alternatives raised coincides in detail with the version attested elsewhere, and assumed to be traditional (*Il.* 21.113).⁵⁶ Tears communicate the same epistemological uncertainty non-verbally. The irony would be the greater if Andromache in articulating the last fear were made virtually to quote (unwittingly, of course) language traditionally used to narrate Astyanax's death (*Il.* 24.735 and *Little Iliad* fr. 21.4 Bernabé).

Dramatic irony works by keeping character knowledge and audience knowledge distinct.⁵⁷ Interesting effects are to be had, however, by permitting the two to cross.⁵⁸ From their own character perspectives Andromache and Astyanax in *Iliad* VI can only have intuitions, premonitions, forebodings of what may happen to them later. From an (informed) audience's perspective, however, everything has already happened; it is all already part of the characters' literary biographies.⁵⁹ Accordingly, we may usefully distinguish two conceptions of a 'life'. Within the fiction of the *Iliad* Andromache is understood to have a life, or 'life history', much as we all have one.⁶⁰ But Andromache—granted that she is a pre-Homeric figure—also has a life in a sense reserved for characters in a literary tradition.⁶¹ This 'life' is the summative history of a character's appearances in 'literary' works; we thus may speak of the 'intertextual life' of a literary or mythological hero(ine).⁶² (It is, of course, a question how stable the 'life' of any epic character was.)⁶³ If the character's consciousness of their own 'life history' is allowed to become confused with the audience's consciousness of their 'intertextual

⁵⁵ Herter 1973: 159: 'Astyanax [wird] das erleiden, was in der letzten Totenklage der Mutter sich schließlich in seherischer Klarheit enthüllt'; N. J. Richardson 1993: 112; Di Benedetto 1994: 291.

⁵⁶ Macleod 1982: 151. Differently, Kullmann 1960: 186–7.

⁵⁷ e.g. Duckworth 1933: 70–9.

⁵⁸ Cf. Duckworth 1933: 80–99.

⁵⁹ Dué 2002: 1: 'Homeric poetry is defined by its *traditionality*: any given audience on any given occasion of performance knew the story and the characters already.' 'Literary biography': e.g. Maguire 2009: ix.

⁶⁰ Minchin 2005: 61: 'Every one of us holds in memory a sequence of stories about himself or herself and the things he or she has done. These stories, taken together, amount to an informal life-history.'

⁶¹ Andromache will be pre-Homeric if *Little Iliad* fr. 21 Bernabé (cf. *Iliou persis*, Summary Bernabé p. 89 ll. 20–1) reflects pre-Homeric tradition: so Burgess 2001: 65–6; differently, Kullmann 1960: 186, 353 (but cf. 2002: 171–2 n. 56, 172–3 n. 59). The character introduction at *Il.* 6.395–8 proves nothing either way: Scodel 2002: 99; cf. Kullmann 1960: 186; Erbse 1993: 398–9. Astyanax's death as pre-Homeric: Burgess 2012a: 212–14.

⁶² 'Intertextual life': Hinds 1993: 17. Scodel 2002: 90: 'In many oral epics, characters and situations have a rich existence before the story begins, in all the tales told before.'

⁶³ Andersen 1990: 40–1.

life', then the character, as well as the audience, may be affected by an uncanny sense of *déjà vu*: Andromache and Astyanax and the nurse (their traditionality, again, being taken for granted) have already been in scenes very like that of *Iliad* VI many times before. Little wonder from this point of view that the baby Astyanax recoils in fright from the helmeted warrior who reaches out to him (*Il.* 6.466–70), or that Andromache laments her husband as he leaves for the battlefield. The scholiast (bT *Il.* 6.471) saw the 'slight cause' (μικρὰ αἰτία) of Astyanax's distress, compared to his parents' own 'great grief', as provoking their humorous reaction; we might rather say that on a denotative dimension the scene affords Astyanax 'slight cause' to take fright, but that on a connotative dimension it affords him real cause for fear; Astyanax's tears help to steer the audience between the two dimensions.⁶⁴ Here characters' tearful premonitions interact with the audience's knowledge of the poetic tradition—as may also, perhaps, Ninsun's in *Gilgamesh*, Charlemagne's in the *Chanson de Roland*, or the Burgundians' in the *Nibelungenlied*.

To speak of a confusion between a character's 'life history' and their 'intertextual life' brings us close to the phenomenon known to narratologists as *metalepsis*: the breaking down of the hierarchy between the world of narrator and narratee, on the one hand, and the world of the characters, on the other. *Metalepsis* is far from being a purely postmodern phenomenon.⁶⁵ Attic drama (tragedy, occasionally; Old Comedy, often) exploits the ambiguity between a character's identity as a character in the play and as an actor in the theatrical production or as a character known from another play.⁶⁶ We may expect *metaleptic* effects to find a foothold in any artistic tradition where there is self-conscious reflection within a work about the work's status as an artistic production and about its situation within a tradition of similar productions. Such self-consciousness may be readily granted to both Attic tragedy and early Greek epic. In connection with the former, P. E. Easterling has pointed out, 'If "dramatic illusion" is not an absolute the question becomes one of degree, whether a particular dramatic tradition actually seeks to remind audiences of the fictiveness of what they are seeing on stage or strives to draw their attention away from the medium itself.'⁶⁷ One way, according to Easterling, in which the Athenian tragic tradition seeks to remind the audience of the fictiveness of what they are seeing is by bringing gods on stage in a 'directorial function', when they 'can... be seen as a device for drawing attention to the medium itself, to the play as a play'.⁶⁸ Precisely this device is Homeric as well

⁶⁴ M. J. Anderson 1997: 59: 'the child himself seems to anticipate already the horrifying future that awaits him'. Cf. Meltzer 1990: 276.

⁶⁵ De Jong 2009a: 92.

⁶⁶ Whitmarsh 2013; cf. Rosenmeyer 1996: 506; Dobrov 2001: 20–1.

⁶⁷ Easterling 1997: 166. Cf. Segal 1997: 215–71, 369–78 on Euripides' *Bacchae* and 'metatragedy'.

⁶⁸ Easterling 1993: 80, 81.

as tragic.⁶⁹ Athene's frequent interventions in the *Odyssey* to ensure that the narrative takes one direction rather than another draw attention to the poem as a poem which is being shaped by the author's unfolding design—figured as the 'plan of Zeus', and implemented by Athene.⁷⁰ According to S. D. Olson, Athene 'presents herself as a sort of surrogate narrator', 'she...serve[s] to a considerable extent as the poet's alter-ego within the tale and is the tool he uses to impose his will upon the action at awkward moments...to turn it in unexpected or otherwise impossible new directions...and to avoid unnecessary questions and complications'.⁷¹ We may recognize this as one of several ways in which the *Odyssey* 'forces the hearer to become aware of the work's construction of its fictionality'.⁷²

It is above all contemporary film that has supplied narratologists with convenient illustrations of metalepsis: for instance, Woody Allen's *Deconstructing Harry* or his *Purple Rose of Cairo*.⁷³ Our purposes may be best served by Tom Tykwer's film *Lola rennt* (*Run, Lola, run*, 1998), which well illustrates the possibilities for crossing character consciousness with audience consciousness. *Lola rennt* presents three parallel storylines—three mutually exclusive, logically incompatible alternatives. Yet at odd moments the characters appear, in defiance of logic, to have learned from their experience in a parallel version. In version two Lola knows how to cock a pistol, which she had to be told how to do in version one. In version three she succeeds in sidestepping a dog in the staircase, which had brought her to grief in versions one and two. In version three, again, she arrives at the bank later than in the other two versions and the security guard comments, 'Bist ja endlich da, Schatz' ('So you've come at last, dear'). His and Lola's facial expressions reveal their mystification at this utterance, which betrays an expectation that Lola should have got there sooner, an expectation that only makes sense if he knows what time she arrived in versions one and two.⁷⁴ He can only know this if he has experienced those versions, as the audience has; and that for the character must be a logical impossibility. The film exploits these effects without troubling to explain how there can be three different versions of the same events, whether one version is

⁶⁹ → Gods as figures for the poet.

⁷⁰ Similar uses of the gods in Virgil; cf. Feeney 1991: 137–8; Kennedy 1997: 147–8.

⁷¹ Olson 1995: 141–2, 156. Cf. Van Thiel 1979: 79; Murnaghan 1995; de Jong 2001: 11, 73; Marks 2008: 19 and n. 4, 38–9, 43–4, 136, 144–6. → Athene as figure for the poet.

⁷² Segal 1994: 123. Cf. Thalmann 1984: 158.

⁷³ Schmitz 2002: 58; de Jong 2009a: 91.

⁷⁴ This scene with the guard in *Lola rennt* has an analogue in the closing scene of Peter Howitt's film *Sliding Doors* (also 1998). The answer that Helen gives James in that scene (James: 'You know what the Monty Python boys say'; Helen: 'Nobody expects the Spanish Inquisition') presupposes knowledge that Helen's character is entitled to only in the mutually exclusive parallel universe that the film explores. As in the guard scene of *Lola rennt*, the mystified looks exchanged by Helen and James at that moment point up the illogicality.

more real than the others, or how a character's experience can be transferable from one supposedly parallel, mutually exclusive version to another; the film thus obliges its viewers to confront its fictionality.

Such modern experiments seem a far cry from Homeric epic. Yet they may not be so very distant.⁷⁵ The guard's comment in *Lola rennt* offers a possible model by which to interpret Andromache's tears and Astyanax's fright. The audience's experience of the poetic tradition would, on this model, be allowed (illogically, intermittently, unpredictably) to infect the characters' experience also. The character's 'awareness' of events in an alternative version would elude their own consciousness, would not be something they could themselves formulate or understand. Homer's Andromache may then be permitted, in her premonitions in book VI, a vague, logic-defying 'recollection' of the fate that she as a character in pre-Iliadic poetry has undergone before. That would give us an interplay between her life as if a real-life figure (her 'life history') and her life as a figure in a 'literary' tradition (her 'intertextual life'). That would in turn argue a highly → self-conscious attitude on the part of Homer towards his tradition.

J. S. Burgess has recently observed comparable effects in the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus experiences events both as unfolding in the present and as already played out, with a similar metaleptic confusion of his 'life history' and 'intertextual life':

It is one thing for Odysseus to discover that his Trojan War experiences have already acquired *kleos* (as encounters with Aeolus, the Sirens, and Demodocus indicate); it is quite another for the hero to find out his wanderings are already known while he is in the midst of them... The consequences are uncanny in nature: Odysseus sometimes discovers that events new to him are known to others; at other times he experiences what he already knew would happen... From our perspective it may seem that external performance and reception of the *Odyssey* have infiltrated Odysseus' internally embedded Apologoi. Whether the *Odyssey* thereby exudes awareness of tradition or confidence of its own innovation—or both—depends on one's view of its genetics.⁷⁶

We may compare with this R. L. Hunter's observations on Euripides' *Cyclops*:

[T]here is a very strong sense, noted by many commentators on the play, that the characters are acting out a story which they know, that they (and the audience) are in fact familiar with the *Odyssey* and are playing out a script which we all know in advance...

With this sense of a predetermined future the *Cyclops* might be thought to anticipate some familiar features of Hellenistic and Roman poetry.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ See esp. O'Hara 2007: 13–14.

⁷⁶ Burgess 2012b: 286. Cf. *ibid.* 286 n. 49, 290; Danek 1998a: 188.

⁷⁷ Hunter 2009: 59.

We should say: the Euripidean *Cyclops* here not only anticipates Hellenistic and Roman developments, it is itself anticipated by—perhaps even consciously follows—the *Odyssey*. The kind of metalepsis (or interaction of a character's 'life history' with their 'intertextual life') that may be found in the *Odyssey* is arguably also found, in more implicit form, in the *Iliad*.

4.4 Example Two: *Iliad* 18.1–147

Our next example comes from the beginning of book XVIII: Achilles learns of Patroklos' death and grieves inconsolably; Thetis comes up from the seabed with the Nereids and takes his head in her hands (*Il.* 18.71). Again we should notice both the symbolism and the tears. Thetis' taking Achilles' head in her hands is another powerful and ambivalent symbol. On the one hand, this is 'a gesture of protective or motherly love'.⁷⁸ The gesture recurs in, for instance, Theocritus' *Heracliscus*, where Alkmene cradles the heads of the babies Herakles and Iphikles and sings them a lullaby (Theocritus 24.6). On the other hand, Thetis' gesture is a standard funerary rite, typically performed for the deceased by his closest surviving female relative. The rite is performed by Achilles for Patroklos in book XXIII and by Andromache and Hekabe for Hektor in book XXIV.⁷⁹ The image of Thetis holding Achilles' head is ambivalent, like the image of Hektor in armour. It signifies, on the one hand, maternal protection, on the other, maternal mourning.⁸⁰

Next, the tears. Thetis and her sisters weep throughout this episode: 'the Nereids went with her, tearful' (65–6), 'grieving she addressed him' (72), 'Thetis addressed him, pouring down a tear' (94). These tears, too, are ambivalent. On the one hand, Thetis quite naturally shares in her son's grief at the loss of his dearest friend. On the other hand, and less naturally for this situation, Thetis grieves as if at the death of Achilles himself.⁸¹ Expressions like 'Thetis led the lament' (51 ἐξῆρχε γόοιο) and 'she wailed' (37 κώκυσεν, 71 κωκύσασα) are as unmistakably funereal as Andromache 'wailing and lamenting' (6.373) or her bewailing Hector 'still alive, in his own home' (6.500–2).⁸²

⁷⁸ Macleod 1982: 147.

⁷⁹ *Il.* 23.136, 24.712, 724. *Prothesis* scenes on Geometric vases: J. T. Kakridis 1949: 68; Vermeule 1979: 15, 16 Fig. 9 (v-BC Attic red-figure *loutrophoros*); J. Griffin 1980a: 28; N. J. Richardson 1993: 184.

⁸⁰ Cf. Σ bT *Il.* 18.71b περιπαθὲς τὸ σχῆμα. Hölscher 1955: 394 unreasonably restricts Thetis' gesture to one of maternal comfort, not mourning.

⁸¹ J. T. Kakridis 1949: 70; Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 166; Arnould 1990: 188; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 119–20.

⁸² ἐξῆρχε γόοιο: *Il.* 24.723, 747, 761. κώκυσεν: *Il.* 24.703 (Kassandra).

This symbolic scene is a foreshadowing (symbolic external prolepsis) of Achilles' death.⁸³ The narrative of the death of Patroklos here does double duty for a narrative of the death of Achilles.⁸⁴ Achilles' own death and funerary ritual become increasingly symbolically present towards the end of the poem.⁸⁵ When Thetis 'stirs up desire for lamentation' among the Myrmidons in the book XXIII, one may reasonably feel that this is more for Achilles than for Patroklos (*Il.* 23.14).⁸⁶ When we see Thetis in the following book, she is again in the midst of the Nereids, and 'weeping for the death of her son, who was about to die in Troy' (*Il.* 24.83–6). This further explicit prolepsis of Achilles' death and funeral picks up the symbolic prolepsis of book XVIII.⁸⁷ By the end of the poem she is already wearing black for mourning (*Il.* 24.94).⁸⁸ So she, too, mourns Achilles 'still alive'.

Again, symbolism is combined with tears and foreshadowing. And again we arguably have an allusion, if we again compare (as neoanalysts have done) the scene of *Iliad* XVIII with a Cyclical epic, this time the *Aethiopis*.⁸⁹ According to the Summary of the *Aethiopis*, after Achilles has been killed by Paris, he is buried by the Greeks, and at his funeral Thetis and the Nereids come up from the sea to mourn him (Bernabé p. 69 lines 19–21). The scene is also reflected in *Odyssey* 24.47–64 and in Pindar's eighth *Isthmian*, lines 57–8. Accordingly, the scene of *Iliad* XVIII, though ostensibly describing Achilles' grief at the death of Patroklos, will evoke in detail Thetis' and the Nereids' grief at the funeral of Achilles as described in earlier poetry, just as *Iliad* VI evokes in detail Andromache's enslavement and Astyanax's killing as described in earlier poetry.⁹⁰ Again, the allusion may conceivably extend to verbatim quotation,

⁸³ Dowden 2004: 201: 'a sort of dress rehearsal for the real lament for her own son'. Explicit (non-symbolic) prolepses of Achilles' death: *Il.* 18.95–6, 19.408–24, 21.110–13, 22.359–60.

⁸⁴ J. Griffin 1980a: 28; Schein 1984: 129–32; Arnould 1990: 188; Burgess 2009: 80.

⁸⁵ Duckworth 1933: 29.

⁸⁶ J. T. Kakridis 1949: 84; N. J. Richardson 1993: 167; Dowden 1996: 59.

⁸⁷ Cf. Σ bT *Il.* 24.85a; N. J. Richardson 1993: 286.

⁸⁸ Cf. Q.S. 4.115: Thetis 'wearing dark-blue veil' (κυανοκρήδεμνος) at the funeral games of Achilles. Black clothes for mourning: M. L. West 1966: 280 (add Eur. *Phoen.* 324–6).

⁸⁹ Pestalozzi 1945: 18; J. T. Kakridis 1949: 84–5; Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 168; Kullmann 1960: 38–9; Danek 1998a: 468–9 and 2002b: 17; M. L. West 2013: 154. Scepticism: Fenik 1964: 32; Dihle 1970: 20–2; Kelly 2012 (see Appendix E).

⁹⁰ Hölscher 1955: 394 observes the parallel between Andromache's lament for the still living Hector in *Iliad* VI and Thetis' lament for the still living Achilles in *Iliad* XVIII, and supposes that this undermines the neoanalytical case for an allusion to the funeral of Achilles in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*): 'Das ist wie die "Totenklage" der Andromache um den noch lebenden Hector 6, 498, wohinter noch niemand eine "wirkliche" Totenklage vermutet hat.' Cf. Kelly 2012: 231 n. 29. On the contrary, a "real" lament *does* lie behind the Andromache scene of *Iliad* VI: it is an internal prolepsis of her real laments in *Iliad* XXII and XXIV, and possibly an allusion to a real lament of Andromache for Hector in pre-Homeric poetry too. Analogously, the Thetis scene of *Iliad* XVIII is an external prolepsis of and allusion to Thetis' real lament for Achilles in pre-Homeric poetry, **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*).

for, famously, $\Rightarrow$ *Il.* 18.26 μέγας μεγαλωστί (κεῖτο) is strikingly close to *Od.* 24.40.

An account of this scene in terms of simple dramatic irony is less easy to give than with Andromache in book VI. Here the character, Thetis, is scarcely less knowledgeable than the audience of what is to happen. But an account of the scene in terms of an interplay between the character's 'life history' and her 'intertextual life' is fully viable. Thetis as a prophetic goddess knows the future, knows what is fated.⁹¹ We have seen that $\rightarrow$ fate in Homer often seems synonymous with the poetic tradition; 'fate' is the way that tradition dictates the story must go. The goddess's knowledge, and the tears which flow from that knowledge, can be seen as another way in which the *Iliad* subtly figures its relationship to tradition. Thetis' foresight (like Zeus' at *Il.* 8.473–7, and elsewhere) evokes the audience's literary hindsight: their knowledge and their expectations of the story.⁹² Thetis knows the way events must unfold in the future, as the audience knows the way they have already unfolded countless times in the past.

The lament of Thetis and the Nereids in book XVIII needs also to be considered alongside two other comparable Iliadic laments, ostensibly for Patroklos, but arguably also for Achilles. First, like his divine mother, Achilles' divine horses Xanthos and Balios weep at the death of Patroklos (*Il.* 17.426–40; compare 23.283–4). Like Thetis, these horses can be understood to be mourning also, symbolically, for Achilles.⁹³ (We may observe that in a Serbian heroic song, Marko Kraljević's horse Šarac weeps proleptically before his master's death.)⁹⁴ The divine horses also resemble Achilles' divine mother in having a clairvoyant foreknowledge of Achilles' death (*Il.* 19.399–424).⁹⁵ We may wish to say that the mourning horses in book XVII conjure up a situation where the horses are weeping for Achilles after his death; that interpretation is prompted by a feeling that the Iliadic scene, while not out of place in its Homeric context, also looks beyond that context to another, similar, context where it would be even more in place. Of the weeping horses in book XVII, M. W. Edwards commented that '[p]ossibly a similar scene figured in epics telling of the death of Akhilleus himself'.⁹⁶ In Quintus of

⁹¹ Chinks in Thetis' omniscience have been detected in her questions to Achilles at *Il.* 18.73–4 and already 1.362–3, e.g. by de Jong 2001: 108. But it is possible to ask what one already knows the answer to: see esp. Achilles to Thetis at *Il.* 1.365; Cheiron to Apollo, *Pind.* *P.* 9.43–51; Ea to Marduk in various Sumero-Akkadian '*Shurpu* incantations' (M. L. West 1997: 351–2). Thetis' 'ignorance' at *Il.* 18.73–4 is bound to appear assumed in the light of *Il.* 17.406–11, esp. 410–11; cf. 18.9–11, 96, 21.277–8.

⁹² Compare again, on prophetic foresight in the *Odyssey*, Burgess 2012b: 285–6.

⁹³ See J. Heath 1992: 396.

⁹⁴ Filip Višnjić, *The Death of Marko Kraljević* (Karadžić 1841–62: ii no. 74 lines 5–24 = Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 209–10).

⁹⁵ M. W. Edwards 1991: 107.

⁹⁶ M. W. Edwards 1991: 104; cf. 18–19; 1990: 322; J. Heath 1992: 399.

Smyrna's *Posthomerica* we do in fact find Achilleus' horses weeping for him at his funeral (3.743–65). Of course, we can see such an allusion without disregarding other powerful effects in the scene, such as the pathetic contrast between the mortal hero and the immortal horses.⁹⁷

Second, like both Achilleus' mother and Achilleus' horses, Achilleus' 'wife', Briseis, weeps at the death of Patroklos (*Il.* 19.282–300), where she, too, has been understood to be weeping also, symbolically, for Achilleus.⁹⁸ In the words of C. Dué, Briseis in this scene 'plays the role of a weeping widow, previewing the lament that she will sing for her new "husband" Achilles, for whom Patroklos is only a substitute'.⁹⁹ The lamenting Briseis seems comparable to the lamenting Andromache.¹⁰⁰ Briseis' tears are plainly polyvalent. The tears here shed for the dead Patroklos are plausibly taken to evoke both the tears she once shed for her first husband (explicit external analepsis: 291–7) and the tears she will shed in the future for Achilleus (symbolic external prolepsis).¹⁰¹ The slave-women, too, accompanying Briseis weep for their own woes (302). The tears of this scene are thus explicitly transferable to other people, other situations. (The external audience, too, may feel prompted to meditate on its own woes, or on the woes of humanity in general.)¹⁰² Again, it is a question whether a scene of Briseis lamenting for the dead Achilleus actually featured in pre-Homeric epic poetry. And again, such a scene is in fact attested outside of Homer, at Propertius 2.9.9–16 and Quintus 3.551–76. Dué infers from this that a lament of Briseis for Achilleus also featured in the early Greek epic tradition.¹⁰³

These arguments about Thetis' tears, the horses' tears, and Briseis' tears are all similar; they are also all compatible, for a single earlier epic could, in theory, have included all three (Andromache, Hekabe, and Helene all lament on Hektor's death in *Iliad* XXIV). But it is necessary to confront some important methodological problems. We are concerned throughout this chapter with certain symbolic scenes of the *Iliad* (and *Odyssey*) which connote another situation. The situation connoted may or may not have any independent existence in pre-Homeric tradition. With all of Thetis' tears, Achilleus' horses' tears, and Briseis' tears, the situation connoted is found in post-Homeric poetry. The question is therefore to what extent the presence of such a scene in post-Homeric poetry authorizes the assumption of the scene's presence in pre-Homeric poetry. The complication is that the post-Homeric poets may—like us—be themselves capable of recognizing that a Homeric scene connotes

⁹⁷ J. Griffin 1980a: 190; Schein 2002; J. Heath 1992: 392–400.

⁹⁸ Briseis as Achilleus' 'wife': *Il.* 9.336, 340–3, 19.297–9.

⁹⁹ Dué 2002: 67; cf. *ibid.* 75–6; M. W. Edwards 1991: 268.

¹⁰⁰ Di Benedetto 1994: 295–6.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Dué 2002: 75, 105.

¹⁰² Compare Odysseus' tears on hearing Demodokos' third song, ⇒ *Od.* 8.521–31. Macleod 1982: 4–7.

¹⁰³ Dué 2002: 13 n. 35; cf. 67 n. 4, 105; cf. Fantuzzi 2012: 120; M. L. West 2013: 154.

another situation, and then determining to realize such a scene in their own poetry.¹⁰⁴

Such a procedure can readily be imputed to Propertius, of concocting the scene of Briseis weeping for the dead Achilles solely from the materials of *Iliad* XIX. Elsewhere Propertius freely reinterprets scenes of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, transposing them into an elegiac key.¹⁰⁵ Likewise Quintus may often take us back not so much to Homer's sources as to the Homeric text itself.¹⁰⁶ Quintus has a keen eye for Homeric motif transferences, and a propensity to return them to their original narrative contexts (→ opposition in imitation).¹⁰⁷ Recognizing that Homer transferred motifs of Achilles' death to Patroklos, he transfers them back to Achilles; his narrative of the death and funeral of Achilles liberally reuses materials from *Iliad* XVI–XXIII (supplemented with *Odyssey* 24.35–97).¹⁰⁸ When Quintus' Athene anoints Achilles' corpse with ambrosia (3.533–5), that is because the goddess did this to Patroklos' corpse in the *Iliad* (19.38–9, 23.185–7). When Athene grants to the dead Achilles the same dreadful expression 'as at the slaying of his companion Patroklos' (Q.S. 3.357–9), Quintus → signals the Iliadic model. In the case of Briseis' tears, therefore, we may assume that Quintus recognized that the tears shed for Patroklos in *Iliad* XIX connoted a scene of Briseis weeping for Achilles, and decided to realize that scene in his own narrative. That would achieve a certain intensification of effect: Briseis' tears now really *are* in place, and the scene merely symbolically present in Homer becomes really present in Quintus.¹⁰⁹

Thus Propertius and Quintus easily come under suspicion of realizing situations that they recognized to be connoted by symbolic Homeric scenes, rather than preserving genuinely early material (directly or indirectly deriving from the *Aethiopsis*) to which, in a still earlier hypothetical form, Homer

¹⁰⁴ Cf. the discussion at P. J. Kakridis 1995: 98. → Reifying alternative version.

¹⁰⁵ Benediktson 1985, esp. 23–4; Fedeli 2005: 282; cf. 257, 262–3.

¹⁰⁶ It is difficult to take, e.g., Q.S. 3.26–82 as supplying pre-Homeric motifs of Achilles' death (so, tentatively, Janko 1992: 399). Quintus' narrative here is thick with Homeric intertexts (Vian 1963: 97, 98, 169), esp. Q.S. 3.48–50 ἤδη γὰρ καὶ πρόσθε μ' ἀποστρέψας ὀνυμαγδοῦ / ἤπαφες, ὁππότε πρῶτον ὑπεξεσάσας ὀλέθρου / Ἑκτορα, evoking and → conflating *Il.* 20.443–54 and 21.596–22.20 (see under § 4.9, for the allusive implications of the words underlined). On the direction of influence between *Il.* 23.192–218 and Q.S. 3.698–718, see, variously, J. T. Kakridis 1949: 81; James 2004: 287.

¹⁰⁷ In this vein, Quintus arguably recognizes that the Iliadic narrative of Hektor killing Patroklos is modelled on one of Memnon killing Antilochos (2.447–50; cf. *Il.* 16.823–8) and that Sarpedon is modelled on Memnon (2.550–4; cf. *Il.* 16.681–3).

¹⁰⁸ Vian 1959: 33–4; Hopkinson 1994: 107; Fantuzzi 2012: 155. In Quintus, the Nereids, Muses, and Thetis mourn for Achilles (Q.S. 3.582–604; cf. *Il.* 18.35–69, plus *Od.* 24.47–62); the winds are summoned for Achilles' cremation (Q.S. 3.699–716; cf. *Il.* 23.192–230; J. T. Kakridis 1949: 84); Thetis is present at Achilles' funeral games (Q.S. 4.110–17; cf. *Il.* 23.14; Dowden 1996: 59).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Tsomis 2007: 194.

may be alluding.¹¹⁰ Those suspicions may be allayed somewhat by the fact that on two occasions Propertius and Quintus both depict a scene likely to derive from the *Aethiopis*: our scene of Briseis lamenting for Achilles (Prop. 2.9.9–16, Q.S. 3.551–76), and a scene of Achilles lifting the helmet of the dead Penthesileia and gazing on her beauty (Prop. 3.11.15–16, Q.S. 1.657–61).¹¹¹ Such agreements may point more to the shared use of a real source than to independent invention prompted by Homer's text.¹¹² But fresh suspicions arise: if there is a genuine source, it could be a Hellenistic rather than an archaic one—or perhaps Quintus just draws on Propertius.¹¹³

It is instructive to consider how the same suspicion of realizing a situation connoted or implied by a scene in Homer can also attach to the Cyclical poets.¹¹⁴ Famously, Aristarchus supposed that the Cyclical poets regularly took cues from Homeric character-text (e.g. Hektor's speech to Andromache in *Iliad* VI, and Andromache's lament for Hektor in *Iliad* XXIV) and spun these into full-blown narrator-text (e.g. Andromache's enslavement and Astyanax's killing in the *Little Iliad*).¹¹⁵ That view retains some currency in modern scholarship, but it invites powerful objections.¹¹⁶ The evidence of early Greek art suggests that much mythological matter that is found in the Cyclical epics must predate the Homeric poems.¹¹⁷ The *Iliad* appears to draw quite consistently on Cyclical material, especially that of the *Cypria*, rather than vice versa.¹¹⁸ It seems implausible that the Cyclical epics should so constantly be extrapolating myth on the basis of such scant Homeric references.¹¹⁹ At issue here is no less than the foundational assumption of

¹¹⁰ Poems of the Trojan Cycle as possibly available to Quintus in the third (?) century AD: Maciver 2012: 8–9; Bär and Baumbach 2015: 607. Differently, Horsfall 2003: 468; James 2005: 367; M. L. West 2013: 26, 50.

¹¹¹ Prop. 2.13.45–50 as coming from the *Aethiopis*, directly or indirectly: T. W. Allen 1912: 126–7; Sbardella 2011: 41; M. L. West 2013: 153. It might rather be an elaboration of *Od.* 3.111–12 (and 4.186–8): cf. Fedeli 2005: 404.

¹¹² James 2004: 273; Fantuzzi 2012: 271 n. 11; cf. Hopkinson 1994: 105.

¹¹³ Lost Hellenistic source: Fedeli 2005: 282; Papanghelis 1987: 117–18; M. L. West 2013: 154; cf. Fantuzzi 2012: 150–7; similarly, for Virgil and Quintus: Heinze 1993: 37–47 = 1915: 64–78; Vian 1959: 97–103; differently, Erbse 1971: 567–8. Quintus as drawing on the Latin poets: Keydell 1949/50; James and Lee 2000: 11, 80–2, 92–3; Gaertner 2005; James 2007; cf. Baumbach and Bär 2007: 20–1; differently, Vian 1959: 95–101.

¹¹⁴ See § 1.6, pp. 32–3.

¹¹⁵ For this Aristarchan position (reflected in excerpts of Aristonicus in the *Iliadic A-scholia*), see on, e.g., (1) Andromache and Astyanax: *Σ A Il.* 6.457a, *Σ A Il.* 24.735a; cf. *Σ T Il.* 22.62–4; (2) Iphigeneia's sacrifice: *Σ A Il.* 1.108–9b; (3) Troilos' killing: *Σ A Il.* 24.257b; (4) the Teuthranian campaign: *Σ A Il.* 1.59. This position critiqued: Severyns 1965: 7–8, 11 = 289–90, 293; Janko 1992: 27; Burgess 2001: 153, 197 n. 12; Scafoglio 2004b: 294, 297 and n. 20; cf. Musäus 2004: 84–94.

¹¹⁶ Burgess 2001: 149–57; cf. Danek 2005a: 9–11, 13.

¹¹⁷ Burgess 2001: 35–44.

¹¹⁸ Kullmann 1960, esp. 358, 369–73; 2015: 120–3; cf. Currie 2015.

¹¹⁹ Tsagalis 2014: 241–2. Thus, *pace* Aristarchus, the *Cypria* hardly invented the whole Teuthranian campaign from *Il.* 1.59 (Kullmann 2012a: 213; 2012b: 16–17), Iphigeneia's sacrifice

neoanalysis: that Cyclical epics often reflect pre-Homeric traditions; it is not possible, or necessary, to mount a full defence of it here.¹²⁰

We should make a distinction between the three Iliadic connotative scenes of weeping by Briseis, by Achilles' horses, and by Thetis and the Nereids. It is hard to be confident that either Propertius or Quintus puts us in touch with a genuine archaic poetic or mythological tradition regarding Briseis or Achilles' horses. By contrast, there is hardly any room to doubt that Thetis and the Nereids' weeping at Achilles' funeral was narrated in archaic Greek epic. The scene is attested directly for the *Aethiopis* by the Proclan Summary (whose testimony receives welcome fifth-century confirmation in Pindar's eighth *Isthmian*, lines 57–8), while the Odyssean *Deuteronekyia* (24.47–64) attests the scene for us at the earliest possible stage of the post-Iliadic epic tradition.¹²¹ It is thus easy to believe that the scene connoted by Thetis and the Nereids weeping in *Iliad* XVIII existed in earlier poetry, and relatively easy to think that Homer may be alluding to such a scene. There may have been a cultural rupture separating Quintus from non-Homeric archaic epic, but there can have been no such rupture dividing the archaic Greek epics of the Cycle from their pre-Homeric heritage.¹²² It is eminently possible that Propertius and Quintus are responding just to the Homeric text, but much harder to regard the *Odyssey*, *Aethiopis*, or *Little Iliad* as just doing so. Propertius and Quintus, moreover, have a fairly transparent interest and agenda in alluding to the *Iliad*; the *Aethiopis* and *Little Iliad* do not.¹²³ Our two Iliadic scenes (Hektor and Andromache, 6.369–502; Thetis and the Nereids, 18.1–147) are symbolic and richly connotative; the corresponding Cyclical scenes (*Little Iliad* fr. 21 Bernabé, *Aethiopis* Summary Bernabé p. 69 lines 19–21) are to all appearances limpid and flatly denotative (although the manner of their transmission may be partly responsible for those appearances). The textual pointers thus support the assumption that the *Iliad* is alluding to the material of the Cyclical poems, rather than that the Cyclical poems, in response to the *Iliad*, are concocting something, prequel-like, for the *Iliad* to be alluding to. We are effectively asking a trio of interlocking questions: how likely is Homer to be making a real allusion to a scene in pre-Homeric poetry? How likely is a

from *Il.* 1.108–9 (Currie 2015: 291–2), or the killing of Troilos from *Il.* 24.257 (Kullmann 1960: 292–3).

¹²⁰ See, e.g., Burgess 2001, esp. 155–6; Scafoglio 2004b: 292–4.

¹²¹ Pind. *I.* 8.56a–58 draws on the *Aethiopis*: Mann 1994: 315–16; M. L. West 2011d: 61–2. Pindar surveys predominantly 'Cyclical' material in *I.* 8.26a–55: M. L. West 2013: 44. → Pindar and *Aethiopis*.

¹²² Dowden 1996: 49: 'their [the Cyclical poets'] access to tradition should not be funnelled exclusively through Homer'. Quintus: → Quintus and Epic Cycle.

¹²³ Of the Cyclical epics, the *Cypria* (e.g. fr. 1, 28 Summary Bernabé p. 43 lines 66–7) is most easily seen as alluding to the *Iliad* (Taplin 1992: 85; Dowden 1996: 48; M. L. West 2013: 27), but even this is very controversial (Burgess 2001: 149–52; Currie 2015: 293–4, 294–5, 296–7).

post-Homeric text (*Aethiopis*, *Posthomerica*, etc.) to be reflecting an early poetic tradition independent of Homer? And how likely is the post-Homeric text to be just realizing a scene connoted by Homer? There is no chance, of course, of an even quasi-scientific quantification of the answers to these questions; but the values must fall out differently for the *Odyssey*, *Aethiopis*, and *Little Iliad* than for Propertius and Quintus. Of our three connotative Homeric scenes of weeping (by Briseis, by Achilles' horses, and by Thetis and the Nereids), the last, therefore, has a different kind of claim to be alluding to a scene from pre-Homeric poetry. Still, the possibility deserves consideration in all three cases.

It is apparent that we must be open to the possibility that Homer can effect either a real allusion (where the audience is asked to recall the connoted scene from earlier poetry) or a notional allusion (where the audience is asked simply to conjure up the connoted scene in their imaginations). We might say that the 'ideal audience' will have known which it was dealing with. With the real audience things cannot have been so straightforward. Yet audience members who failed to recognize a real allusion would often have been able to appreciate a connotative Homeric scene just by guessing at the scene connoted; that is, by treating the allusion as if it were notional.¹²⁴ That does not mean, however, that it was irrelevant whether a real or a notional allusion was made: a special effect would be reserved for those who recognized a real allusion for what it was.

4.5 Example Three: *Iliad* 17.651–701

At the end of *Iliad* XVII news of Patroklos' death finally reaches Antilochos, who is fighting on the edge of the battlefield; Menelaos tells him to take the news to Achilles. In this passage there is no symbolism, but there are some prominent tears: 'Antilochos detested the news; for a long time speechlessness gripped him and his eyes filled with tears' (*Il.* 17.695–6).¹²⁵ He is still weeping when he brings the news to Achilles at the start of the next book (18.17, 32). Why? It is hard to call these tears ambivalent. Far from there being multiple discernible causes for his tears, there is no obvious cause of his weeping. Many Greeks have learned of Patroklos' death earlier in the book, none have reacted quite like this (Aias' tears at 17.648 are different). We can easily invent

¹²⁴ Cf. Scodel 2002: 4–5: 'The death of Patroclus imitates the death of Achilles in a way that is thematically important in the *Iliad*. Patroclus dies wearing Achilles' armor. When Thetis then responds to her son's grief as if she were mourning his death, these details invite even a listener who had not heard a song about Achilles' death to guess at what Achilles' death rituals must have been.'

¹²⁵ *Il.* 17.695–6 = $\Rightarrow$ *Od.* 4.704–5. Cf. also *Il.* 23.396–7, *Od.* 19.471–2.

explanations, such as that the young Antilochos was particularly tender-hearted, or that he was particularly close to Patroklos (the latter is the suggestion of a scholiast).¹²⁶ The narrative, however, says nothing to this effect.¹²⁷ The tears are left without explicit motivation. It is important, therefore, to register in the first place the mismatch between the explicit intensity of Antilochos' emotional response to the action and the lack of explicit motivation for that response: another interpretative 'gap'.

Comparison again with the *Aethiopis* supplies Antilochos' tears with a motivation, though not a straightforward actorial motivation. In the *Aethiopis* Antilochos is killed by Memnon, Achilles kills Memnon in revenge, and Achilles is in turn killed by Paris (*Aethiopis* Summary Bernabé pp. 68–9, lines 12–16). Neoanalytical scholars have emphasized how close this storyline is to the *Iliad*, where Patroklos is killed by Hektor, Achilles kills Hektor in revenge, and Achilles will be killed by Paris.¹²⁸ The Iliadic Patroklos seems calculated to recall the Antilochos of this tradition in various ways (see § 2.3). If, as many have supposed, Homer's audience was familiar with this mythological (or poetic) tradition, then Hektor killing Patroklos in the *Iliad* will have evoked Memnon killing Antilochos.

When Aias instructs Menelaos to try to find Antilochos, he introduces the request with the words, 'look if you can see Antilochos still alive (ζῶν ἔτι)' (17.652–3; cf. 681). This casual-seeming addition raises the possibility, and thus plants a thought that otherwise would not have arisen, that Antilochos might be dead. The phrase resembles what was said of Hektor in the book VI scene: 'they lamented Hektor, still alive (ἔτι ζῶν), in his home' (6.500). A notable similarity between the weeping Antilochos and the weeping Andromache is that Antilochos is the last (other than Achilles) to hear of Patroklos' death (17.377–80, 681–96), as Andromache is the last to hear of Hektor's death in book XXII (437–41), her ignorance there contrasting powerfully with her prescience in book VI.¹²⁹ Those touched most closely are often the last to hear.¹³⁰ This goes also for Achilles with Patroklos' death

¹²⁶ Σ bT *Il.* 17.695a1, adverting to *Od.* 11.468 (which does not indicate any friendship between Antilochos and Patroklos either). Further to his assumed friendship with Patroklos, Antilochos' distress is said to be compounded by a sense of Nestor's responsibility for Patroklos' death (cf. *Il.* 11.796–803): Σ bT *Il.* 17.695a1.

¹²⁷ It does, however, intimate friendship between Antilochos and *Menelaos*: Willcock 1983: 481; Taplin 1992: 192; Burgess 1997: 11 n. 30.

¹²⁸ Kullmann 1977: 533 = 1992: 202–3; Kullmann 1984: 310, 312–13 = 1992: 143, 145–6; Willcock 1983: 483; M. W. Edwards 1991: 19; Dowden 2004: 201. On the 'vengeance theme' in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*), see § 2.3, p. 58.

¹²⁹ Σ bT *Il.* 17.695b: ἄριστα ὁκονόμεηκεν ὁ ποιητὴς τὴν τοῦ Πατρόκλου θανάτου ἄγνοιαν, ὥς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀνδρομάχης· καὶ γὰρ αὕτη ἐκτὸς τῆς ὑπονοίας οὔσα τοῦ τεθνηκέναι τὸν Ἑκτορα ἐν χαλεπωτέρῳ γίνεται πένθει ἀκούσασα.

¹³⁰ Reinhardt 1961: 357: 'Der, dem es am meisten an's Herz greift, bleibt am längsten ohne Kunde.'

(17.641–2, 18.3–14).¹³¹ And it goes for Penelope in the *Odyssey* when she learns, late, of the danger to the departed Telemachos (4.729–31). There, just as with Antilochos in *Iliad* XVII, ‘for a long time speechlessness gripped her and her eyes filled with tears and her full voice was checked’ (*Od.* 4.704–5 = *Il.* 17.695–6). Those tears are entirely natural in their place in the narrative, but they also reinforce the allusive symbolism of the Odyssean scene. Penelope’s loss of and grief for her departed son re-enact and recall her loss of and grief for her departed husband. The tears point to the connotations of the scene: as Penelope formerly grieved for her departed husband, so she now grieves for her departed son: *Od.* 4.724, 727 ... *πρὶν μὲν πόσιν... νῦν δ’ αὖ παῖδ’* ...; effectively, a motif transference, signalled as such in the text. More generally, Telemachos’ *πάθεα* in the Telemachy are an allusive → doublet of Odysseus’ in the *Odyssey* as a whole.¹³²

With Antilochos in book XVII, tears once again point the audience to another situation which is implicit in the narrative. In this case there is no symbolism that would help us to associate Patroklos’ death with Antilochos’. Rather, the association between Antilochos and Patroklos seems to depend entirely on the audience’s ability to perceive the similarity between Patroklos’ situation in the *Iliad*’s narrative and Antilochos’ situation in extra-Iliadic tradition. There is also no foreshadowing. This example seems to presuppose audience knowledge of an independent mythological tradition, and so here the case for allusion seems especially strong.¹³³ With Antilochos’ tears it is as if not merely the audience but the character himself is put in mind of his own death in a parallel version. Antilochos is allowed an uncanny sympathy with the character (Patroklos) who here suffers what, in other poetry, he suffers himself. This seems to be a particularly good illustration of the role of ‘pregnant’ tears in signalling motif transference from one character to another. It is also open to us to see Antilochos as undergoing a similar kind of *déjà vu*

¹³¹ Cf. *Σ* bT *Il.* 17.401–2. Cf. Ares and Askalaphos: *Il.* 13.521–5, 15.110–42. M. W. Edwards 1980: 23: ‘There are a number of examples of this sudden view of a character who is not participating in the immediate action or perhaps even aware of it, but who is intimately concerned (at least in the poet’s mind). Often they have a strong emotional effect’; cf. J. Griffin 1980a: 110 and n. 13.

¹³² Telemachos as a substitute for Odysseus: cf. Arnould 1990: 188. The ‘Telemachy’ plays out the *Odyssey* in miniature: cf. R. B. Rutherford 1985: 138–9, for the parallels; Odysseus himself makes the link explicit at *Od.* 13.418. The suitors’ murderous intentions towards Telemachos mirror their murderous intentions towards Odysseus (2.246–51, 4.669–73, 4.700–1, 13.383–4). Penelope’s and Laertes’ continual grief at Telemachos’ absence mirror their continual grief at Odysseus’ absence (11.181–3, 11.195–6, 13.379, 16.139–45, 17.6–9). Eurykleia’s being taken into Telemachos’ confidence before Penelope mirrors Eurykleia’s being taken into Odysseus’ confidence before Penelope (2.372–3, 4.745–9, 19.485–6, 23.75–7). Penelope’s reunion with Telemachos mirrors hers with Odysseus (17.38–40, 23.207–8).

¹³³ Kullmann 2005: 19: ‘Die Szenenfolge wird poetisch nur verständlich, wenn man unterstellt, daß das Publikum Antilochos als einen Freund Achills aus anderer Epik kannte’; Reinhardt 1961: 357.

experience, resulting from the crossing of his 'real' and his 'literary' lives, as we have observed in *Lola rennt*.

This would have a partial but instructive analogue in Greek lyric poetry. In the mythical narration of Bacchylides' fifth ode, Herakles descends to the underworld, where he hears from the soul of Meleagros the story of the latter's death and weeps out of sympathy for him. Herakles' tears receive a remarkable emphasis: we are told that this is the only time in his life that Herakles wept (155–8). These tears of Herakles, and especially the claim that they were the first he shed, are likely to be a Bacchylidean invention, despite, or precisely because of, the narrator's feint towards tradition: 'they say', 155.¹³⁴ Herakles weeps out of sympathy for Meleagros; but behind his tears is a dimension of 'fellow-feeling' (*sympatheia*) that he cannot himself guess at. Meleagros' fate, death at the hands of a close female relative through a strange type of fire-magic (136–54), is what awaits Herakles himself. (Meleagros' life, we may note, as perhaps Bacchylides himself did, already served as a paradigm for Achilles at *Iliad* 9.524–605: Phoinix's embedded story.) The ominous mention of Deianeira as a possible bride for Herakles at the end of the narrative (172–5) actually brings that fate closer to fulfilment.¹³⁵ Herakles is therefore allowed, through shedding tears for Meleagros, an uncanny sympathy with the character who is his substitute in the ode's narrative. The ode does not narrate Herakles' end, but his fate is vicariously summoned up through Meleagros'. Herakles' tears of sympathy underscore the equivalence of the two characters, point up the connotation of Herakles' life story in Meleagros'.¹³⁶

In this Bacchylidean example, a character's tearful sympathy with another character parallels the audience's recognition that the characters in question are allusive doublets. In *Iliad* XVII, the tears of sympathy underscore the equivalence between Antilochos and Patroklos. The neoanalytical hypothesis of motif transference from Antilochos in a pre-Iliadic **Memnonis* to Patroklos in the *Iliad* seems best, if not uniquely, able to explain the equivalence between these two heroes. As Achilles weeping for Patroklos is also weeping for himself,¹³⁷ so Antilochos weeping for Patroklos in effect weeps for himself. Whereas Briseis and the slave-women weep knowingly for themselves in weeping for Patroklos (*Il.* 19.301–2), Achilles and Antilochos do so with less or no such conscious knowledge: it is above all we, the audience, who recognize the 'true' connoted object of their weeping.

¹³⁴ Other tears claimed to be Herakles' first: Eur. *HF* 1353–6, Soph. *Tr.* 1070–2. Cf. Monsacré 1984: 141; Suter 2009: 67.

¹³⁵ D. L. Cairns 2010: 89.

¹³⁶ On Herakles' (and Meleagros') tears in this poem, see D. L. Cairns 2010: 81, 86, 240–1.

¹³⁷ Monsacré 1984: 141: 'Quand Achille sanglote sur Patrocle, c'est aussi sur lui qu'il gémit. Dans la mesure où Patrocle est un "autre lui-même", sa mort préfigure bien évidemment celle d'Achille.'

Finally, it is worth recalling in this context the argument of Chapter 2 that Antilochos' weeping links him with his allusive doublet, Patroklos, and him in turn with his allusive doublet, Phoinix (*Il.* 18.17, 16.3, 9.433; see §§ 2.3, 2.4, pp. 59, 74).

4.6 Example Four: *Odyssey* 19.467–79 (the *Niptra*)

At the climax of the foot-washing scene in *Odyssey* XIX, Eurykleia, washing the feet of the disguised Odysseus, sees his scar and recognizes her master. Eurykleia's reaction is one of intense emotion, marked by tears: 'Joy and pain together seized her in her heart, and her eyes filled with tears, and her full voice was checked' (*Od.* 19.470–1).¹³⁸ We should note again the incongruity between the importance with which Eurykleia's highly charged emotional response invests the scene and the inconsequentiality of the scene for the development of the plot. In this scene the poet plays with the possibility that Eurykleia's recognition of Odysseus' could have been Penelope's (see § 2.2). The tears of joy-relief shed by Eurykleia could easily have been, might more properly have been, Penelope's. In book XXIII Penelope will shed similar tears of joy when she is finally reunited with Odysseus (205–8). In the *Niptra*, the scene of Penelope's recognition has been transferred to Eurykleia, who thus serves as a → surrogate in the narrative for Penelope.¹³⁹ We should notice how Athene intervenes in book XIX to prevent Penelope from noticing (476–9). The narrative thus draws attention to the possibility that Penelope *might* recognize Odysseus, while her narrative surrogate, Eurykleia, does so. We may compare how in *Iliad* XVII the narrative draws attention to the possibility that Antilochos *might* be dead, while his narrative surrogate, Patroklos, is dead: 'look if you can see Antilochos still alive'.¹⁴⁰

There is, further, symbolism in this scene in the clanging of the bronze basin and the spilling of the water: '[Odysseus'] leg fell in the basin, and the bronze rang out, and was tilted back to one side, and the water was poured out over the ground' (19.469–70). The narrative attention lavished on this trivial detail hints at a deeper significance, as with Hekabe's falling veil, Andromache's falling shuttle, and the latter's falling headdress (*Il.* 22.406–7, 448, 468–72). It is as if—in an equivalent English idiom—Odysseus' secret has 'leaked out';

¹³⁸ The same phrase is used of Eurykleia's tears and Antilochos' tears in *Iliad* 17: *Od.* 19.471–2 ~ *Il.* 17.695–6; cf. of Penelope at *Od.* 4.704–5: 'her eyes filled with tears, and her full voice was checked'.

¹³⁹ Steiner 2010: 7.

¹⁴⁰ See § 4.5, p. 127. Compare, on 'reversal passages' ('then A would have happened if B had not occurred'), J. V. Morrison 1992b: 67: 'The reversal passage allows the poet to comment upon his own story. It expresses a self-conscious reflection upon the shift in the narrative by pointing out the abrupt turn.'

‘the beans have been spilled’. According to the symbolism, something decisive should have occurred. ‘Pouring out’ or ‘spilling’ is symbolic of something irrevocable and undesired happening, as in that other English proverb, ‘to cry over spilt milk’.¹⁴¹ Yet in reality nothing of moment has actually occurred in the foot-washing scene. The dramatic symbolism of the spilled basin as well as the emotional intensity conveyed by the tears—appropriate to Eurykleia, certainly, but all the more appropriate to Penelope—are discrepant with a narrative in which little of consequence has happened. The discrepancy, I suggest, orients the audience towards another narrative possibility (an → interpretative gap).

It is unclear whether we should say that this episode alludes to another existing version, rather than to a merely notional alternative version. There is no clear evidence for an earlier version of Penelope’s recognition of Odysseus along the lines of the foot-washing scene of *Odyssey* XIX. This is, of course, the general difficulty with attempting to apply the neoanalytical method to the *Odyssey*: there is virtually no independent testimony to the mythological background, as there is the Epic Cycle for the *Iliad*.¹⁴² Still, several scholars have been tempted to believe that the poet is playing off the audience’s knowledge of such an earlier version of the recognition; the speech of the soul of the murdered suitor Amphimedon in *Odyssey* XXIV in particular has led some to surmise that the *Odyssey* poet knew and reacted against a version in which a recognition and reunion of Odysseus and Penelope occurred before the killing of the suitors (see § 2.2). In the previous two chapters the Odyssean foot-washing scene has been found to be amenable to the same kind of analysis as certain scenes of the *Iliad* (especially *Iliad* XVI), where neoanalytical arguments make it plausible that there is allusion to earlier poetry (see § 3.5, drawing on §§ 2.2, 2.3). The presence of the tears constitutes another point of similarity between the scene in *Odyssey* XIX and the scenes in *Iliad* VI, XVII, XVIII. But if that may seem to strengthen the case somewhat for seeing a real rather a notional allusion in *Odyssey* XIX, our next example will remind us that we are certainly not obliged to do so.

4.7 Example Five: *Odyssey* 16.11–22

At the beginning of *Odyssey* XVI Telemachos, evading the suitors’ ambush and arriving safe on Ithaca, makes his way to Eumaios’ hut, where the swineherd has been entertaining Odysseus. This is the first time in the poem

¹⁴¹ Burkert 1985: 14 = 2007: 84: ‘Der Akt des “Gießens” ist ein Paradigma der Unumkehrbarkeit.’ Cf. also A. M. Bowie 2013: 169: ‘dropping objects as an expression of surprise etc. at cardinal moments’.

¹⁴² But see Danek 1998a.

that Telemachos and Odysseus come face to face. It is, in fact, the first time they have clapped eyes on each other since Telemachos was a baby. This, in other words, is no insignificant moment for the poem. It is also one that has been long anticipated (*Od.* 11.450–1, 15.156–8).

The narrative gives notable attention to the tears of joy and relief shed by Eumaios: 'a thick tear fell from him' (16). Such tears might, one cannot but feel, have been more obviously shed by Odysseus.¹⁴³ Later on in this book Odysseus will indeed shed tears of joy when he finally reveals himself to Telemachos: 'speaking thus he kissed his son, and let fall from his cheeks a tear to the ground, though previously (πάρως) he had always restrained them' (190–1), where 'previously' effects a back-reference to our scene (11–22).¹⁴⁴ It appears that the scene of Odysseus' reunion with Telemachos has been transferred to Eumaios; in other words, Eumaios here functions as a narrative surrogate for Odysseus.¹⁴⁵ This time a simile makes it plain: Eumaios embraces Telemachos 'as a father embraces his son' (17–19).¹⁴⁶ Once again, a transference is explicitly 'signalled' in the text.

This example has obvious similarities to the previous one. There, a scene of reunion between Odysseus and Penelope was transferred from Penelope to Eurykleia, with Penelope on the sidelines and just failing to observe what was taking place.¹⁴⁷ Here, a scene of reunion between Odysseus and Telemachos is transferred from Odysseus to Eumaios (a loyal old retainer comparable to Eurykleia), with Odysseus observing from the sidelines. In each passage we find the symbolically dropped vessel (16.13–15: 'the swineherd sprang up in amazement, and the pails fell from his hands, with which he had been busy, mixing the sparkling wine'; 19.469–70, cited in § 4.6).¹⁴⁸ In each passage Athene intervenes in the action arguably as a way of drawing attention to how the poet is thwarting the natural expectations raised by the narrative.¹⁴⁹ In one case the goddess' intervention is to ensure that the reunion between Odysseus and Telemachos takes place at the right time (16.155–77); in the

¹⁴³ Odysseus' dry-eyedness in general: Lateiner 1995: 183–7. On the restraining of tears in the *Odyssey*, especially by Odysseus, see Monsacré 1984: 144–8.

¹⁴⁴ R. B. Rutherford 1986: 157 = 2009: 178; de Jong 2009b (1994): 4.

¹⁴⁵ Van Thiel 1979: 66; R. B. Rutherford 1986: 157 = 2009: 177; M. W. Edwards 1987a: 105; de Jong 2009b (1994): 74. Telemachos' use of the address ἄττις (*Od.* 16.31, etc.) emphasizes Eumaios' role as 'fatherlike': Brandt 1978; P. V. Jones 1988: 149; A. M. Bowie 2013: 10.

¹⁴⁶ Other details in the simile suggest an application to Odysseus: the ten-year absence, the phrase ἄλγεα πολλά (16.19; cf. 1.4, 13.418, 16.189): Podlecki 1971: 89; Moulton 1977: 132–3; H. P. Foley 2009 (1978): 190; Danek 2006a: 58.

¹⁴⁷ In such episodes, the silent presence of a character on the sidelines of the action can be highly significant (→ character on the sidelines). Contrast Fenik 1974: 65–6, esp. 66: 'All [Homer's] attention is devoted to the characters in the immediate foreground while all else fades away and ceases, for all practical purposes, to exist'; P. V. Jones 1988: 149, 168. See further Hölscher 1978: 61–2, for the implications of Odysseus as a 'spectator', 'silently present', and 'rejoicing' at *Od.* 18.281–3.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. *Od.* 14.34.

¹⁴⁹ → Athene as figure for the poet.

other it is to prevent the reunion between Odysseus and Penelope occurring at the wrong time (19.479).

Should we assume that here the poet is playing with audience knowledge of other mythological or poetic tradition? That cannot be excluded, but the grounds for doing so seem weakest here. Of course, we know very little about how a reunion between Odysseus and Telemachos might have been handled in earlier poetry. Yet various considerations point to a version where the reunion took place on Crete, and in such a version it must have proceeded on quite different lines from those in *Odyssey* XVI.¹⁵⁰

It may be helpful again to consider an analogue. Virgil in a famous scene deploys a similar technique when Amata weeps at Turnus' resolve to meet Aeneas in single combat (*Aen.* 12.54–80). Amata's tears (54 *flebat*, 55 *has... lacrimas*, 72 *lacrimis*) would, we feel, more properly be shed by Lavinia. Indeed, they cede in the narrative to Lavinia's own tears (64 *lacrimis*, 65 *perfusa genas*). It is reasonable to conclude that Amata functions as a narrative surrogate for Lavinia: the emotions proper to Lavinia have been transferred, with flagrant breach of propriety, to her mother.¹⁵¹ R. O. A. M. Lyne asked of this passage, 'Why does [Lavinia] weep?', and then continued:

Lavinia's sense of propriety, Vergil's sense of propriety, forbids Lavinia herself to speak. But Amata's words seem in some way to have spoken for her, to have caught her mood; anyway to have affected her. She reacts to Amata's words, more particularly (as I would stress) she reacts *in line* with them. She weeps: *accepit vocem lacrimis*: like, and with, Amata... Why?... She weeps for the same general reason as Amata... She weeps in similar response to the same crisis.¹⁵²

Lyne's reading may be seen in the context of passages like *Od.* 16.11–21 and *Od.* 19.467–79. Did Virgil observe a Homeric technique, or was this simply a technique that could be employed by (first-rate) poets independently (a similar question was posed in § 2.3, pp. 68–9)? It is hard to say, and perhaps does not matter much, since the most important upshot of the parallel for our purposes is that it obliges us to recognize and interpret a key Homeric technique: the use of a character's extreme emotion (tears) to flag up motif or character transference. In *Odyssey* XVI emotions that are most properly the father's are transferred from Odysseus to Eumaios; in *Odyssey* XIX emotions that are most properly the wife's are transferred from Penelope to Eurykleia; in *Aeneid*

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Tsagalis 2012: 318–19.

¹⁵¹ Amata's assumption of Lavinia's bridal role appears also from *Aen.* 12.600 (sc. *Amata*) *se causam clamat crimenque caputque malorum*: cf. 6.93 *causa mali tanti coniunx* and 11.480 (sc. *Lavinia*) *causa mali tanti*; cf., of other brides (Helene and the Sabine women), Cic. *Phil.* 2.55 *belli causa*; Hor. *Serm.* 1.3.107–8 *belli / causa*; Livy 1.13.3 *nos causa belli*.

¹⁵² Lyne 1983: 54, 56 = 2007: 136, 138 (italics original). That Lavinia's blush exposes her as harbouring romantic feelings is suggested by the Catullan intertext, 65.19–24 (a simile, whence *ore rubor*, 24, is arguably reprised at *Aen.* 12.66 *rubor... ora*, leading into the double simile at 67–9). Differently, Tarrant 2012: 105.

XII emotions that are most properly the lover's have been transferred from Lavinia to Amata. In these, as in the other cases considered, tears point up a transference; they suggest that one character is functioning as a narrative surrogate for another, express a fellow feeling or *sympatheia* that encourages us to associate the characters.

In general, the scene connoted may or may not have a real, independent existence in earlier poetry; there is certainly no need to assume a pre-Virgilian tradition in which Lavinia was in love with Turnus. But where the alternative version did exist, there would be a powerful effect for those who recognized the allusion.

4.8 Pregnant Tears and Transferred Motifs

A key argument of this chapter is that an emotional surplus, especially tears, can flag up what, following neoanalytical scholars, we may call a 'transference': they advertise that the episode belongs most germanely to this character in another situation, or to another character in another situation (the situation may or may not have any objective, independent existence: the 'transference', in other words, may be real or notional). The technique emerges as surprisingly widespread: apart from the two Homeric epics, examples have been adduced from Bacchylides, Virgil, the *Nibelungenlied*, the *Chanson de Roland*, and Henry James.

Tears can flag up transferred motifs in various ways. In the two Odyssean examples and in the example from *Aeneid* XII, the weeping character (Eurykleia, Eumaios, Amata) acts as a narrative surrogate for another character by whom the tears would more properly be shed and who, as it happens, is present in the scene as an onlooker on the sidelines (Penelope, Odysseus, Lavinia). In the examples from *Iliad* VI and XVIII, the tears would be more properly shed by the same character (Andromache or Thetis) in another situation, one which is connoted by the narrative situation.¹⁵³ The case of Antilochos in *Iliad* XVII is different again: Antilochos' weeping associates him with Patroklos, his narrative surrogate in the text; the fate suffered by Patroklos in the *Iliad* evokes Antilochos' own in the wider mythological-poetic tradition. Similarly in Bacchylides Ode 5, Herakles' weeping associates him with Meleagros, his narrative substitute in the text; the fate suffered by Meleagros in Bacchylides' ode evokes Herakles' own in the wider mythological-poetic tradition. (Incidentally, it is suggestive of the broad differences between the

¹⁵³ For the two types, cf. Burgess 2006a: 161: 'In another type of motif transference, a specific motif is applied to the same character with whom it was originally associated but transferred to a new chronological time in his story.'

poems that in the *Odyssey* the tears are of joy and relief, but of grief and foreboding in the *Iliad*.)

The kind of tears that I am calling 'pregnant' are not satisfactorily accounted for with reference solely to the denotative level of the narrative. The 'pregnancy' of these tears constitutes a 'gap', 'tension', or 'impropriety', which urges us to look to the connotative level; often the scene features powerful symbolism (objects and/or gestures), which points in the same direction. Compare how R. Garner has explained the workings of metaphor and allusion:

The failure of the message on a literal level, the puzzle which a metaphor presents to be solved, is often called the gap or tension. The interpretation or solution, which explains how the image of the vehicle can be applied to the tenor, bridges that gap or releases the tension. The element which alerts the audience to the problem, whether it is simply a single seemingly inappropriate word or a more complicated product of words oddly combined, has been called an ungrammaticality, an impropriety, or a deviation from the norm. An ungrammaticality interrupts the narrative flow; sometimes, it is literally incorrect... Such an intrusion invites interpretive thought; through reference to the vehicle, a new and more complex understanding is reached. The tenor has been enriched in the mind of the interpreter so that the ungrammaticality no longer seems ungrammatical, the impropriety no longer improper.¹⁵⁴

In our cases, the 'interpretive solution' that 'bridges the gap' is the assumption that we are dealing with 'transferred emotions': the assumption that, although not out of place in their current narrative context, emotions of this intensity, or emotions which receive this degree of narrative emphasis, would be more in place in another context, which the present context allows one to surmise. Tears in general can be a signal to the audience that something highly significant is taking place or is about to take place.¹⁵⁵ When the audience registers that nothing very significant is happening on the denotative level of the narrative, it may feel authorized to intuit that something more significant is intended on the connotative level.¹⁵⁶

Of all physical manifestations of emotion, tears seem particularly apt to discharge this function of flagging up a transferred motif. Smiles and laughter may do this too, though, it would seem, less frequently than tears.¹⁵⁷ Above all,

¹⁵⁴ Garner 1990: 5. Cf. Conte 1986: 38–9. But see too Edmunds 2001: 165–6, esp. 166: 'metaphor is not a good way to describe intertextuality. At best, metaphor is a metaphor for intertextuality.'

¹⁵⁵ An excellent example is Patroklos' remarkable tears at the beginning of *Iliad* XVI, which receive an extraordinary amount of attention through the narrative and characters' speeches (with similes in each: 3–4, 7–11). Clearly, something momentous is about to occur, both for Patroklos and for Achilles himself.

¹⁵⁶ → Inconsequentiality.

¹⁵⁷ Laughter in general is more seldom: Colakis 1986: 137 (114 scenes of weeping against 23 of laughing in the *Odyssey*).

when in the games for Patroklos Achilles smiles, for the first and last time in the poem, at Antilochos in the context of his quarrel with Eumelos (*Il.* 23.555), the intratextual relationship between this episode in book XXIII and the quarrel in book I between Achilles and Agamemnon is flagged.¹⁵⁸ Arguably, *if* that same quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles in *Iliad* I is evoked in the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles in Demodokos' first song, then the inclusion of Agamemnon as an onlooker on the sidelines and his 'rejoicing in his mind' (*Od.* 8.78) may be seen to hint at his role in the Iliadic scene (the Iliadic quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles being here transferred to Odysseus and Achilles, as it is to Menelaos and Antilochos in *Iliad* XXIII).¹⁵⁹ When the suitors 'die with laughter' (*Od.* 18.100) at Odysseus' laying low of Iros, we have a clear foreshadowing of their own fate in book XXII, of which their laughing shows them to be as ironically unaware as Andromache's tears show her to be ironically aware of the fate that awaits her in *Iliad* VI.¹⁶⁰ Their laughter is far more grotesquely out of place (i.e., an interpretative 'gap') than her 'wailing and lamenting'. Similarly proleptic, that is, connotative as well as denotative, is the suitors' laughing fit in which they 'laughed with jaws not their own... and their eyes filled with tears and their heart presaged lamentation' (*Od.* 20.345–9).¹⁶¹ Penelope's laughter in the poem (*Od.* 17.542, 18.163), too, 'has a touch of the uncanny: it represents a quasi-intuitive sense of the direction events are taking'.¹⁶² On the basis of such scenes some may be prepared to allow Homer a concept of the unconscious.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁸ Martin 1989: 188–9 n. 71: 'As often in the *Iliad*, we get the impression that a character has heard the previous poetic narration... The recognition of a kindred young heroic spirit prompts Achilles' famous smile here (23.555).' See esp. Eustathius on *Il.* 23.553 = iv.782.21–783.1 van der Valk; Rengakos 2007: 107–8; cf. Taplin 1992: 255–6; N. J. Richardson 1993: 228–9; Kullmann 2005: 20; Halliwell 2008: 99; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 120. On the quarrels in books XXIII and I: Macleod 1982: 30–2; Lohmann 1992: 308–10; Di Benedetto 1994: 180–3; Alden 2000: 19 and 108 n. 78.

¹⁵⁹ Demodokos' first song as evoking, with similarities and differences, the beginning of the *Iliad*: Clay 1983: 103–7; Taplin 1990: 111–12; D. L. Cairns 2001: 11–12 and n. 42; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 136; Rinon 2006: 209–11; Lentini 2006: 96–7; Saïd 2011: 128 and n. 54; Dekel 2012: 78; cf. Danek 1998a: 142–50; Sommerstein 2006: 85. Differently, D. F. Wilson 2005: 3; cf. Burgess 2001: 43 with 207–8 n. 131, 63, for these quarrels as a 'typical motif'.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. *Od.* 18.35, 111. Levine 1982: 200: 'Their laughter emphasizes their ignorance and blindness in the face of a drama that is itself a preview of their own downfall'; Lateiner 1977: 174; 1995: 28; Halliwell 2008: 90; Steiner 2010: 16. The suitors' laughter contrasts with Odysseus' smiles: Levine 1984; Miralles 1994. Laughter in the *Odyssey*: Colakis 1986; Halliwell 2008: 86–97.

¹⁶¹ Halliwell 2008: 93–6. Guidorizzi 1997 interprets the scene from 'an ethnopyschological point of view' (p. 1).

¹⁶² Halliwell 2008: 95 n. 104.

¹⁶³ Penelope and Odysseus and the 'unconscious' (*Odyssey* XIX–XX): Russo 1982, esp. 6–7 n. 8; Hölscher 1988: 272–9. Hektor and the 'unconscious' (*Il.* 22.90–144): Burnett 1991: 275–88. J. Griffin 1987a: 58–9 sees in the *Odyssey* 'a psychological density which recalls the novel rather than the epic'; cf. 2004: 162; differently, S. R. West 2012b: 532. Note *Od.* 20.349 γόνον δ' ὠϊέτο θυμός (Colakis 1986: 139–41; Konstan 2009: 317): here the suitors seem as deaf to the intuitions of their own souls as they are to the prophecy of Theoklymenos (350–7); the νόημα that Athene 'turned

It will of course be clear that epic poetry makes abundant and very various use of tears, many of which have nothing to do with allusion. It is not being claimed here that tears, even ‘pregnant’ ones, everywhere and anywhere in Homer signal an allusion. Tears may be regarded as at most an ‘authorizing criterion’, one that warrants the surmise of the presence of an allusion, not a ‘guaranteeing criterion’ of its presence.¹⁶⁴ In general, we cannot ever be sure that the other situation presupposed by a scene of ‘pregnant’ tears was known to the ‘ideal audience’ from earlier poetry, and there is hardly ever (if ever) the necessity to assume that it was. However, in my examples from *Iliad* VI, XVII, and XVIII, where the neoanalytical case is already fairly well established, and perhaps also in *Odyssey* XIX, it is attractive to think that the situation presupposed was (in R. Scodel’s terminology) both ‘objectively traditional’ and ‘familiar to the audience’.¹⁶⁵ Tears, as an ‘authorizing criterion’, can help us to recognize a transference, notional or real; but they do not help much in deciding which of the two we are dealing with. Since it is above all the ability to set a passage of, say, the *Aethiopis* or *Little Iliad* against a passage of the *Iliad* that makes the case for the *Iliad* alluding to earlier poetry, it may seem superfluous to advert to the presence of tears at all. Far from it: their value lies in suggesting the way in which Homer uses earlier poetry, for gauging the *poetics* of a given motif transference; pregnant tears substantially strengthen the argument for recognizing an actively allusive and self-conscious reception of earlier poetry.¹⁶⁶

4.9 Poetic Memory

Another suggestion of this chapter (more complex and more tentative than the suggestion that pregnant tears can point up motif transference) is the suggestion that tears can express a character’s ‘recollection’ of experiences that properly are not available for that character to recall consciously as a character within the poem, but accrue to them only as a character within a ‘literary’ tradition. Whereas dramatic irony exploits the interplay between character knowledge and audience knowledge, this effect would exploit the interplay

astray’ (346) appears to represent their conscious thought, which remains untroubled (cf. 333, 358, 374, 390), while their *θυμός*, which intuitively laments (349), appears to operate on an unconscious level; compare and contrast Bakker 2013: 93–4. See also Russo 1982: 15, on *Od.* 20.93 *δόκησε δέ οἱ κατὰ θυμόν*. *Od.* 19.479 *τῇ γὰρ Ἀθηναίῃ νόον ἔτραπεν* is similar and different (cf. too *Il.* 18.311 and 6.234). Intuitions of the *θυμός* may elsewhere be fully conscious: *Od.* 18.154; cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 8–11, *Ag.* 975–1000. For an unconscious element active in *sleep*, cf. Pind. fr. 131b.3–5 Maehler. The absence of a Greek term for ‘conscious(ness)’ should not trouble us unduly: esp. Wilkes 1988: 169–72, 196, 200–14; cf. Russo 1982: 16; Hölscher 1988: 273; B. A. O. Williams 1993: 50–1.

¹⁶⁴ ‘Authorizing’ and ‘guaranteeing’ criteria: Haack 1978: 89–91.

¹⁶⁵ Scodel 2002: *passim*. ¹⁶⁶ → Self-consciousness.

between character memory and audience memory. I illustrated this with the example of *Lola rennt*. But it also has something important in common with the account given for Latin poetry by G. B. Conte of 'poetic memory'.¹⁶⁷ Conte points to speeches made by Mars in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (14.812–15):

*tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum
(nam memoro memorique animo pia uerba notauī)
'unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli'
dixisti.*

Once in the presence of the assembly of the gods you said to me
(for I recall the pious words and I made a note of them in my remembering
mind):

'There shall be one whom you shall raise into the blue vault of the sky.'

and by Ariadne in the same author's *Fasti* (3.471–5):

*en iterum, fluctus, similis audite querelas:
en iterum lacrimas accipe, harena, meas.
dicebam, memini, 'periure et perfide Theseu';
ille abiit; eadem crimina Bacchus habet.
nunc quoque 'nullo uiro' clamabo 'femina credat.'*

Lo, again, waves, hear similar complaints;

lo, again, sand, receive my tears.

I said, I remember, 'O, perjuring and faithless Theseus';

he departed; Bacchus incurs the same accusations.

Now, too, I shall cry, 'Let a woman trust no man.'

In the former passage Mars' *memoro*, 'I recall', refers to his knowledge of something he will have experienced previously in his life, and coincides with the reader's knowledge of an episode in Ennius' *Annales*, where Jupiter promised Mars '*unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli / templa*' (54 Skutsch).¹⁶⁸ In the latter passage, Ariadne's *memini*, 'I remember' refers to her knowledge of a previous incident in her life and coincides with something the reader knows the character Ariadne once said in another poem, Catullus 64 (133 '*perfide... Theseu*', 143 '*nunc iam nulla uiro iuranti femina credat*').¹⁶⁹ In both instances, the reader's recollection of literary tradition, of earlier poetry, is figured in the poem as the character's recollection of something in their own life.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ Conte 1986; cf. Hinds 1998: 3–4, 115.

¹⁶⁸ Conte 1986: 58–9.

¹⁶⁹ Conte 1986: 60–2.

¹⁷⁰ Examples of course can be multiplied: Ov. *Met.* 15.160 *memini*: cf. *Il.* 17.45–60 (Barchiesi 2001 (1989): 70); Ov. *AA* 2.169 *memini*: cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.7 (Volk 2002: 164 and n. 19); Virg. *Aen.* 1.23 *memorem*: cf. *Iliad* and *Cypria* (Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 122). Cf. Q.S. 1.9: *μνησάμενοι προτέρων*: the events of the *Iliad* recalled as the Trojans' memories (cf. James 2004: 239; Maciver 2012: 32).

Conte's notion of poetic memory should not be taken for an exclusively, or perhaps not even distinctively, Augustan mannerism. It is employed by both Homer and the tragedians.¹⁷¹ Let us take the latter first. Critics are far readier now than they once were to see intertextuality (allusion) in Euripidean tragedy.¹⁷² At *Hecuba* 239–48, Hekabe reminds Odysseus of the time when he came to Troy as a spy disguised in rags and with self-inflicted wounds and was recognized by Helene. The reminiscence begins with οἶσθ' ἡνίκ' ...; ('Do you remember when...?'), and the appeal to Odysseus' recollection cues an allusive reference to Odysseus' role in previous poetry, ⇒ *Odyssey* 4.244–58.¹⁷³ This obvious allusion is accompanied by an equally obvious Euripidean invention: according to Euripides' Hekabe, Helene let her in on the secret and after Odysseus supplicated her, she let him leave the country.¹⁷⁴ At *Iphigeneia at Aulis* 337–60, Menelaos reminds Agamemnon of the time when the ships were stranded at Aulis and Agamemnon, in his eagerness to command the expedition to Troy, willingly accepted Kalchas' prophecy recommending the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. Again the reminiscence begins with οἶσθ' ὅτ' ...; ('Do you remember when...?'), and ushers in an allusive reference to Agamemnon's behaviour at Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 184–227 (again, there is also significant ad hoc invention).¹⁷⁵ At Sophocles' *Ajax* 1273–87, Teukros reminds Agamemnon of the times when Aias repulsed Hektor in the battle at the ships and faced Hektor in single combat. The reminiscences begin οὐ μνημονεύεις οὐκέτ' οὐδὲν ἡνίκα...;...χῶτ' αὖθις...; ('Do you no longer remember at all the time when...? Or again when...?'), and effect an allusive reference to *Iliad* XV, conflated with XIII, and VII.¹⁷⁶ The same can be achieved without any verb of knowing or remembering.¹⁷⁷ At Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* 765–7, Oidipous reminds Kreon of his treatment of him 'previously... when...' (πρόσθεν..., ὅτ' ...), referring to an earlier incident in Oidipous' life (and Kreon's), but above all cueing for the audience an allusive reference to an earlier play, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1515–22. In Aristophanes' *Frogs*, Dionysos explains that he wishes to re-enact Herakles' *katabasis* itinerary 'that time when you went after Kerberos' (111 τόθ', ἡνίκ'; compare 136, 'the route that you went down then', τότε), with apparent allusive reference to

¹⁷¹ In Alexandrian poetry, where one would expect to find the concept of 'poetic memory', it is more weakly attested; see, however, Nishimura-Jensen 1998: 460, 469; Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 122–5.

¹⁷² See § 1.2, p. 9 n. 46.

¹⁷³ Less likely, a reference to the *Little Iliad* (cf. Bernabé pp. 74–5 ll. 15–16); see § 2.2.

¹⁷⁴ Mossman 1995: 39. The Homeric Helene's 'I alone recognized him' (*Od.* 4.250) becomes the Euripidean Hekabe's 'Helene recognized you and told me alone' (*Hec.* 243).

¹⁷⁵ Eur. *IA* and Aesch. *Ag.*: Garner 1990: 172–6; Michelakis 2006: 28–9; cf. 132 n. 14.

¹⁷⁶ Jebb 1896: 190–1; Garvie 1998: 240–1; Finglass 2011: 490–1.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.272 *quondam*, with allusive reference to *Il.* 22.395–405; *Aen.* 12.349 *quondam*, with allusive reference to *Il.* 10.318–27 (Tarrant 2012: 177).

Euripides' (or Critias') tragedy (or satyr play) *Pirithous*.¹⁷⁸ A similar effect is produced by the confusion of characters' sense of the past with the audience's sense of literary history. At Euripides' *Helen* 1056 Menelaos declares there is 'a certain antiquity' (παλαιότης...τις) in the ruse of feigning one's own death. The statement makes less sense in terms of Menelaos' historical conception than in terms of the literary history of the motif, employed in earlier plays of Aeschylus (*Choephoroi*), Sophocles (*Electra*), and Euripides himself (*Cresphontes*).¹⁷⁹ M. Wright comments on the "deliberate and self-conscious" manner in which myths are presented' in Euripides' escape tragedies: 'Characters and events are described as being "famous"; mythological statements are prefaced by such phrases as "everyone in the world knows that—", and "people say that—."'¹⁸⁰ According to Wright,

[r]eferences of this type are striking and unnatural whichever way they are viewed. They sit uneasily within the fictional situation in which they are uttered... If, on the other hand, one considers such words as being effectively an address to the audience, not to the characters, the incongruity arises through the ironic rupturing of the dramatic illusion.¹⁸¹

It is striking how aptly these observations on Euripides might be applied to the *Odyssey* (e.g. *Od.* 1.326–7, 350–2, 8.74–82, 9.19–20, 9.263–6): compare the comments of J. S. Burgess on that poem cited earlier (§ 4.3, p. 118).¹⁸² The confounding of the world of the audience with that of the characters in these tragic examples comes very close to metalepsis. So do Deianeira's words at the start of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, λόγος μὲν ἔστ' ἀρχαῖος κτλ., 'There is a saying of old', where '[t]he reference to the proverb reaches outside of the immediate context to establish contact with the contemporary Athenian audience'.¹⁸³

Some Homeric passages are strikingly similar.¹⁸⁴ At *Iliad* 21.396–9, Ares reminds Athene of the time when she stirred on Diomedes to stab him, and she herself drove the spear through him. Ares' reminiscence begins, ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε...; ('Don't you remember when...?'), and makes an intratextual reference: the audience are prompted to think back to *Iliad* 5.855–8.¹⁸⁵ At *Iliad*

¹⁷⁸ Dobrov 2001: 148.

¹⁷⁹ Allan 2008: 260–1; R. B. Rutherford 2012a: 360. For παλαιά in this sense, cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 580.

¹⁸⁰ Wright 2005: 136. ¹⁸¹ Wright 2005: 136.

¹⁸² Burgess 2012b: 283–7, 286–7.

¹⁸³ Quotation from Kraus 1991: 81–2. Cf. Soph. *El.* 566, where ὡς ἐγὼ κλύω appears to 'footnote' the *Cypria* (cf. *Cypria* Summary Bernabé p. 41 lines 43–6).

¹⁸⁴ Kullmann 1960: 386: 'Es gehört wohl zum Eindrucksvollsten der Ilias, wie die Menschen in ihr im Banne des Vergangenen und Künftigen leben... Ständig heißt es πρὶν μὲν—νῦν δέ, ἡματι τῷ ὅτε... (vgl. χθίζα καὶ πρωΐζ', ὅτ'), ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε, ... μνησάμην! oder umgekehrt οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν, ὅπως ἔσται..., ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτε... So wird das Faktische der Sage auch da, wo es tatsächlich referiert wird, umgesetzt in Erinnerung und Ahnung und somit vergeistigt.' Cf. Moran 1975: 203; cf. 199, 204; Scodel 2002: 126; Danek 2005a: 19 n. 41; 2006b: 20.

¹⁸⁵ Moran 1975: 202; Andersen 1990: 26; N. J. Richardson 1993: 10, 88.

15.18–30, Zeus reminds Hera of the consequences of his anger when she tricked him in order to persecute Herakles. His reminiscence begins again with | ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε...; and appears to amount to an allusive reference to Herakles mythology, or early epic poetry on Herakles, which is recognized as one of many ‘sources’ of the *Dios apate*.¹⁸⁶ Herakles mythology or an early Herakles epic is likewise the object of an allusive reference when Athene remonstrates that Zeus does not remember how she frequently aided Herakles in his labours for Eurystheus (*Il.* 8.362–3 οὐδέ τι τῶν μέμνηται, ὅ...),¹⁸⁷ When in the Iliadic theomachy Poseidon charges Apollo with failing to remember their mistreatment at the hands of Laomedon (*Il.* 21.441–2 οὐδέ νυ τῶν περ / μέμνηται), he alludes to an evidently well-known episode in which Poseidon and Apollo built the walls of Troy and Poseidon sent the sea-monster which Herakles subsequently killed.¹⁸⁸ Achilleus, when reminding Aineias of the time he put him to flight and took his cattle, presumably alludes to an episode from earlier poetry or mythology, tangible for us in the *Cypria* (*Il.* 20.188 ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε...; compare *Cypria* Summary Bernabé p. 42 lines 61–3).¹⁸⁹ When in the underworld Agamemnon’s soul reminds Amphimedon’s soul of an embassy to Ithaca undertaken by Menelaos and himself, he evidently alludes to a notorious episode from earlier poetry or mythology, again recoverable from the *Cypria*, embellishing it with ad hoc invention (*Od.* 24.115 | ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε...; *Cypria* Summary Bernabé p. 42 lines 61–3).¹⁹⁰ The phrase | ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε...; which occurs three times in the *Iliad* and once in the *Odyssey*, may be a formulaic expression used to remind someone of something that they may be taken to task for forgetting.¹⁹¹ Formulaic or not, the phrase seems to be used consistently in extant Homeric epic to play on the audience’s memory of earlier poetry, either an earlier passage of the present poem or of other poetry.

Frequently in Homer characters know, recollect, and remind others of stories that they have ‘heard’, and which are simultaneously recognizable by

¹⁸⁶ See too *Il.* 14.249–62; cf. 234. Herakles at Cos after sacking Troy in early epic tradition: ‘Hes.’ *Cat.* fr. 43a.61–4 Erbse 1970: 94; M-W. Moran 1975: 199–200; Janko 1992: 191, 199; Sbardella 1994: 154; M. J. Anderson 1997: 93; Danek 1998a: 247; Scodel 2002: 147–50; Hirschberger 2004: 280–1; D’Alessio 2005b: 235 n. 72; M. L. West 2011a: 31, 36, 293.

¹⁸⁷ Moran 1975: 203.

¹⁸⁸ The use of the article, τὸ κῆτος (*Il.* 20.147), implies a familiar episode: Moran 1975: 202; M. W. Edwards 1991: 307; Gantz 1993: 400; N. J. Richardson 1993: 91; M. J. Anderson 1997: 93; M. L. West 2011a: 32.

¹⁸⁹ Moran 1975: 201–2; M. J. Anderson 1997: 63; cf. Burgess 1996: 83 n. 29. Cf. also *Il.* 20.90 καὶ ἄλλοτε (→ words of iteration), with Kullmann 1960: 282, 283 n. 1. Differently, Heubeck 1950: 18 argues that the *Cypria* follows the *Iliad* here. The episode may be depicted on a Boeotian relief amphora of as early as c.625 BC (*LIMC* s.v. ‘Achilleus’ no. 389).

¹⁹⁰ Moran 1975: 206; Heubeck 1992: 371–3; P. V. Jones 1992: 78–9, 81; Danek 1998a: 477; Tsagalis 2012: 328–30.

¹⁹¹ M. W. Edwards 1991: 312: ‘ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε is formulaic.’ Note also Theocr. 5.116 ἦ οὐ μέμνωσ’: perhaps we might think of a ‘colloquial formula’ (Hoekstra 1964: 14–15, 37; 1969: 11).

the audience as familiar mythological or poetic material.¹⁹² This appears to be the case when Achilles recalls to Thetis her accounts of rebellion in heaven (*Il.* 1.396–7 *πολλάκι γάρ σεο πατρός ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἄκουσα / εὐχομένης, ὅτ' ἔφησθα...*, 407 *τῶν νῦν μιν [sc. Δία] μνήσασα...*).¹⁹³ Or when Phoinix recalls to Achilles the story of Meleagros (*Il.* 9.524–5 *οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν / ἡρώων*, 527–8 *μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ πάλαι οὗ τι νέον γε / ὥς ἦν*).¹⁹⁴ Or when Diomedes in the *Doloneia* reminds Athene of her patronage of Tydeus (*Il.* 10.285–90 *σπέῳ μοι ὥς ὅτε πατρὶ ἄμ' ἔσπεο κτλ.*).¹⁹⁵ Or when Aineias points out to Achilles the fame of their respective lineages (*Il.* 20.203–4 *ἴδμεν δ' ἀλλήλων γενεήν, ἴδμεν δὲ τοκῆας / πρόκλυτ' ἀκούοντες ἔπεα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων*), where we may reasonably enough take the passage 'to refer to epic poetry celebrating the exploits of the two heroes'.¹⁹⁶ Or when Odysseus recalls the omen of the sparrows at Aulis (⇒ *Il.* 2.301–3 *εἶ γὰρ δὴ τόδε ἴδμεν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν... ὅτ'...*).¹⁹⁷ Or when Antenor reminds the Trojan elders in the *Teichoskopia* of the embassy of Menelaos and Odysseus (*Il.* 3.205 *ἦδη γὰρ καὶ δευρό ποτ' ἤλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς*).¹⁹⁸ Or again when Antinoos remembers the wives of former heroines (*Od.* 2.118–22 *κέρδεά θ', οἷ' οὐ πῶ τιν' ἀκούομεν οὐδὲ παλαιῶν, / τάων αἰ πάρος ἦσαν ἐϋπλοκαμίδες Ἀχαιαί κτλ.*).¹⁹⁹ Equivalently, reference can be made to the past without any verb of remembering, by means of temporal adverbs or similar expressions. The phrase 'the horses of Tros, which once (*ποτ'*) [Diomedes] took away from Aineias, but Apollo saved the hero himself' (*Il.* 23.291–2) makes an intratextual cross reference to *Il.* 5.318–27, 344–6. We should note too the use of 'when', 'as previously', 'others too', in the *Odyssey's* persistent references to the Phaeacians' having acted 'previously' as escorts to men (*Od.* 7.323 *ὅτε*; cf. 8.31 *ὥς τὸ πάρος περ*, 32 *τὶς ἄλλος*, 16.227–8 *καὶ ἄλλους*), where according to A. F. Garvie, 'the reference must be to some story created at an earlier stage of the tradition'.²⁰⁰ Not that we should, of course, suppose that the audience

¹⁹² Nestor especially appears as a figure for the poet. In Homer: Dickson 1995; Marks 2008: 112–31; cf. Mülder 1910: 44–9. In Quintus (cf. 8.480, 4.144–70): Schmitz 2007: 79–83. In Ovid: Papaioannou 2002; 2007: 95–6.

¹⁹³ Moran 1975: 205 and n. 24; cf. Slatkin 1991: 60–2 and n. 6.

¹⁹⁴ Moran 1975: 204; Dickson 1995: 67, 71–2; Mackie 1997: 79 n. 6; Dowden 2004: 197. Cf. Kullmann 2012a: 217, for the pre-Iliadic legend of the Calydonian boar hunt.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Torres-Guerra 1995: 79; cf. Willcock 2001 (1964): 440–1; Gantz 1993: 512–13.

¹⁹⁶ M. W. Edwards 1991: 315, after G. Nagy. Differently, Ford 1992: 64 and n. 14; Scodel 2002: 77.

¹⁹⁷ Kullmann 1960: 189, 263.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. *Cypria*, Summary Bernabé p. 42 lines 55–6. Kullmann 1960: 275–6; Danek 2006b: 8, 20; cf. 2005: 19 n. 41.

¹⁹⁹ Sammons 2010: 61–2 and n. 8. Cf. Danek 1998a: 231 (on *Od.* 11.225–330); S. R. West 2012a: 130 and n. 25; I. C. Rutherford 2012: 163–4.

²⁰⁰ Garvie 1994: 232; cf. 242. Cf. Danek 1998a: 140–1. Differently, Hainsworth 1988: 340; cf. M. L. West 2014: 129–30, 190. The Phaeacians as traditional: Heubeck 1974: 114; cf. Sergent 2002. *καὶ ἄλλους*: → words of iteration.

genuinely ‘remembers’ something every time when a character does. When Penelope reminds Antinoos of the story of his father Eupheithes (*Od.* 16.424 ἡ οὐκ οἶσθ’ ὅτ’ ...;), it is probable that, in G. Danek’s words, ‘the episode has no basis in the tradition, but is “invented” by the narrator for the context of this passage’.²⁰¹ It is tempting to say that in some cases reference is surely made to existing poetic or mythological tradition, that in others the matter may be wholly invented, and in others again that there is likely to be a mixture of referencing of tradition and ad hoc invention.²⁰² But it is hard to dispute that there is likely to be at least sometimes exploitation of what the audience may have heard in previous poetry.

A case can therefore be made for a similar deployment of poetic memory in Homer as in Sophocles and Euripides. We may see a line of reception from Homer and Euripides to the Latin poets, and reading ‘backwards’ up the line of reception is not a bad way to understand the Homeric technique. In all these Greek and Latin examples of ‘poetic memory’ the characters remind themselves or other characters of events from their own fictional ‘lives’, and at the same time remind an audience (reader) of what the audience (reader) saw the characters undergo in another, independent, fictional work. This ambiguity of perspective, whereby the character’s ability to recall events of their past is run into the audience’s ability to recall poems of their previous experience, is commonly accepted for at least one passage of Homeric poetry.²⁰³ At *Odyssey* 12.70 the mention of ‘the Argo, who is on everyone’s lips’ (Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα), effects a transparent reference to the ship of that name, familiar to Homer’s audience from pre-Homeric Argonautic poetry, and acknowledged here as the model for Odysseus’ voyage, though with the vital qualification that Odysseus ‘is not to replicate Jason’s adventure’.²⁰⁴ This relatively uncontroversial instance of poetic memory in Homer finds an impressive parallel in the Standard Babylonian *Gilgamesh* X.250, where the mention of ‘Utnapishtim, of whom men tell’, acknowledges Utnapishtim (aka Atrahasis), familiar again from earlier poetry (*Atrahasis*), as the model for Gilgamesh’s quest for immortality, though once again with the crucial qualification that Gilgamesh ‘cannot follow in his footsteps’.²⁰⁵ The same technique of poetic memory recurs in Henry Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews*, book iv, chapter 4; when Mr Booby announces to his aunt: “Madam, this is that charming Pamela, of

²⁰¹ Danek 1998a: 326 (translated). P. V. Jones 1992: 78, 79–80 considers either ad hoc invention or the adaptation of a traditional story possible.

²⁰² Moran 1975: 199 n. 12; Danek 2005a: 14; Andersen 2012: 146.

²⁰³ Compare another form of Homeric metalepsis ‘where characters “announce” the text in which they themselves figure’ (de Jong 2009a: 98): *Il.* 6.357–8, *Od.* 24.196–8, and perhaps *Od.* 22.345–9.

²⁰⁴ Quotation: M. L. West 2005: 39 = 2011b: 278. Cf. Danek 1998a: 255–7; Burgess 2012b: 274. → Signalling.

²⁰⁵ Quotation: George 1999: 45.

whom I am convinced you have heard so much,” he refers to the Pamela made famous—not for Lady Booby, but for Fielding’s readers—by Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela*, whose eponymous heroine is Joseph’s sister and literary antitype for Fielding. If *Odyssey* 12.70 helps to establish the concept of poetic memory as Homeric, these further-flung comparanda, *Gilgamesh* and *Joseph Andrews*, show (backwards and forwards in time) how self-consciously ‘literary’ a concept this typically is.

Let us return to the main suggestion of this chapter, that tears, like memory, can be a figure of allusion. Pregnant tears work like, but also unlike, memory. With poetic memory, allusion is explicit: the audience (or reader) is explicitly pointed to the other situation, which is evoked by expressions such as ‘once...’, ‘when...’, or ‘now also...’; with tears, the other situation is left implicit. Whereas poetic memory is fully verbalized, tears are entirely non-verbal.²⁰⁶ With memory, recall is effected fully and consciously by the character; with tears, recall is vague and partial, and eludes the character’s consciousness.²⁰⁷ Poetic memory involves no actual breach of logic, for the character recalls events which can unproblematically be assumed to have been part of the character’s own life; with pregnant tears, the events ‘recalled’ cannot be understood to be a part of the characters’ own lives, for they belong to their future.

Yet Homeric characters can certainly ‘know’ what is going to happen in the future of the story.²⁰⁸ The dying Hektor taunts Achilles with his death at the hands of Paris and Apollo at the Scaean gates: ‘on that day when Paris and Phoibos Apollo shall slay you, valiant though you are, at the Scaean gates’ (*Il.* 22.359–60). Even allowing for a convention that, as R. Janko puts it, ‘[d]ying was held to bring precognition’, Hektor’s comment is remarkable, and not the less so for the fact that Hector is ‘prone to be mistaken about the state of things’.²⁰⁹ Hektor ‘knows’ the poetic tradition; he practically quotes it to Achilles.²¹⁰ The Iliadic passage involves a breach of ‘Jørgensen’s law’, the convention that, unlike the ‘omniscient’ primary narrator, characters in Homeric epic (unless with the benefit of a divine informant, as Achilles at

²⁰⁶ Non-verbal acts in Homer: Lateiner 1995; 2011a. Even if tears are non-verbal, weeping is arguably endowed with propositional content (intentionality): Konstan 2009: 313.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Lateiner 2011a: 138, for weeping as a ‘subconscious and uncertainly in-awareness’ non-verbal behaviour; *ibid.* 139 for tears and laughter as ‘uncertainly conscious’ behaviour.

²⁰⁸ Patroklos at *Il.* 16.853–4; the horse Xanthos at *Il.* 19.416–17.

²⁰⁹ Quotations from Janko 1992: 420 and Andersen 1990: 27 respectively. Cf. Σ T *Il.* 16.851–4, Σ AT *Il.* 16.854a, Σ b *Il.* 16.854a; Servius on Virg. *Aen.* 10.740; Duckworth 1933: 19. Remarkable too is *Il.* 22.329, the verse in which the narrator justifies giving this death-throes speech to Hektor; de Jong 2009a: 114 considers this an instance of metalepsis, and adds, ‘I would not hesitate to consider this a—unique—sleight of hand on the part of the narrator Homer’; compare, however, *Il.* 19.407, 418.

²¹⁰ *Aethiopsis Testimonia* 9 p. 66 Bernabé, Summary Bernabé p. 69 line 16 cf. *Il.* 16.712, 18.453, 19.416–17, 21.277–8. Janko 1992: 399, 410; N. J. Richardson 1993: 143; Burgess 2009: 46. On Hektor’s (patchy) knowledge of the future, see Kullmann 1968: 26–8 = 1992: 231–4.

Il. 21.277–8) remain ignorant of the identity of the specific deity who intervenes (or, here, will intervene) in human affairs.²¹¹ Hektor's insight is uncanny, logic-defying, more like what we get in *Lola rennt* than anything else.²¹² Audience knowledge (poetic memory) here again interferes with character (fore)knowledge.

Hektor's remarkable prophetic vision in which he quotes the poetic tradition has a remarkable parallel in Serbian heroic song: on the eve of the battle of Kosovo, Miloš Obilić prophetically foretells his own killing of the Sultan Murad I and the treachery of Vuk Branković in the battle, and in so doing references the poetic tradition.²¹³ This intriguing parallel suggests that at least some of the techniques discussed in this chapter may be fully compatible with an oral traditional poetry. At the same time, the burden of this chapter is that Homeric epic can allude to its mythological-poetic tradition with a self-consciousness that bears comparison with Alexandrian or Augustan poetry. It is worth emphasizing once again how pertinent and congenial the insights of scholars of Latin poetry are to the arguments and readings of this chapter.²¹⁴ In respect of this self-consciousness it may matter less that Homer and (say) Ovid are on opposite sides of an oral-written divide than that both poets are working within the same medium of traditional mythology. To work in that medium means to have recourse, continually, to the same cast of traditional characters with the same (largely) settled biographies. This is also true of South Slavic song; and it is true, as a rule, of tragedy, as Antiphanes' 'Poiesis' famously pointed out (fr. 189 PCG).²¹⁵ It is not true, as a rule, of modern novels or film, where characters are invented and bring with them no pre-existing baggage.²¹⁶ *Lola rennt* is a partial exception, one that proves the rule:

²¹¹ Danek 1998a: 81; Marks 2008: 41. Other breaches of the 'law': Il. 16.845, 22.299 (de Jong 2012: 133). Cf. 'paralepsis', the phenomenon where the narrator's (primary narrator's) knowledge interferes with a character's (secondary narrator's) knowledge: de Jong 2001: xvi; Nünlist 2009: 123–4; cf. Σ bT Il. 16.844–5 *ex*.

²¹² Duckworth 1933: 32 speaks of 'the uncanny foresight of the mortals themselves'.

²¹³ *Fragments of Various Kosovo Songs* no. 3 (Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 135–7 = Karadžić 1841–62: ii no. 50), lines 62–86. A reference to the poetic tradition: see e.g. *Tsar Lazar and Tsaritsa Milica* (Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 146 = Karadžić 1841–62: ii no. 45), lines 190–204.

²¹⁴ Esp. Barchiesi 2001 (1993): 105–6: 'Any reader who also knows the *Iliad* can hardly read the *Odyssey* without being conscious of references to the story's glorious antecedents, and it is extremely difficult to make a distinction between what is remembered by the characters of the *Odyssey* and what might be deliberate allusions to the *Iliad* as a literary text ... But what happens when the older tradition enters a new text as a view of the *future*? The idea that the characters can have a future that has already been written down is much less natural, and calls for constant negotiation between author and reader ... Unless the characters are gifted with second sight, the effect approaches what we usually call dramatic irony: the information that the author shares with the audience tends to create a sort of complicity between them directed against the characters.'

²¹⁵ Compare and contrast Aristot. *Poet.* 1451b25–6. A striking exception to the 'rule' is Agathon's *Anthos/Antheus* (Aristot. *Poet.* 1451b21–2); cf. Olson 2007: 173.

²¹⁶ For exceptions ('transtextual characters'), see B. Richardson 2010.

it creates its own 'tradition' by repeating its own storyline three times, with significant variations. The repeatability, the variability (within certain, ill-defined limits), and the familiarity of mythological material arguably make mythological poetry (to which Homer, tragedy, and Ovid belong alike) naturally receptive to such self-conscious allusive techniques. In this regard, the difference between 'oral' and 'written' appears rather murky.²¹⁷

²¹⁷ Cf. Dowden 1996: 51: 'Greek mythology is an intertext formed from all tellings of myth that "readers" (or listeners) have ever encountered. Thus for any particular myth there is a sense of how the story goes, which need not be dependent on a single telling. Any new telling of a myth positions itself in relation to the intertext and gains its sense and ambience from that relationship. This model is applicable equally to oral and literary traditions.'

Allusion in Greek and Near Eastern Mythological Poetry

I. A GREEK TRANSFERENCE: FROM APHRODITE TO HERA

5.1 Three Early Greek Hexameter Toilette-and-Seduction Scenes

The initial focus of this chapter is on three scenes of toilette-and-seduction performed by a goddess, found in the *Dios apate* (*Iliad* XIV), Demodokos' Song of Ares and Aphrodite (*Odyssey* VIII), and the 'Homeric' *Hymn to Aphrodite*, which prompt the question: typical scene or specific reprise?¹ The scenes, and the question, will subsequently be set in a much larger context, taking in the mythological poetry of the ancient Near East. Our three Greek hexameter scenes include the following passages (with shared phrasing indicated in the right-hand margin):

- | | | |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|
| | βῆ δ' ἵμεν ἐς θάλαμον, τόν οἱ φίλος υἱὸς ἔτευξεν
Ἥφαιστος, πυκινὰς δὲ θύρας σταθμοῖσιν ἐπήρσε
κληῖδι κρυπτῇ, τὴν δ' οὐ θεὸς ἄλλος ἀνῶγεν·
ἐνθ' ἣ γ' εἰσελθοῦσα θύρας ἐπέθηκε φαεινὰς. | = HAph 60 |
| 170 | ἀμβροσίῃ μὲν πρῶτον ἀπὸ χροὸς ἱμερόεντος
λύματα πάντα κάθηρεν, ἀλείψατο δὲ λίπ' ἐλαίῳ
ἀμβροσίῳ ἐδανῶ, τό ρά οἱ τεθυωμένον ἦεν· | cf. HAph 61/Od. 8.364
= HAph 62 |

She [sc. Hera] went into her chamber, which her own son fashioned for her, Hephaistos, and fastened the tight-fitting doors to the doorposts with a secret bolt which no other god could open; there she entered and put to the shining doors.

¹ For the question in general, see Appendix F.

- 170 With ambrosia first she cleansed from her lovely skin
all the dirt and anointed herself richly with oil,
ambrosial, sweet oil, which had been scented for her.
(*Iliad* 14.166–72)

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------|
| | ἢ δ' ἄρα Κύπρον ἵκανε φιλομειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη, | cf. <i>HAp</i> 58 |
| | ἐς Πάφον· ἔνθα τέ οἱ τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις. | = <i>HAp</i> 59 |
| | ἔνθα δέ μιν Χάριτες λούσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἐλαίῳ, | = <i>HAp</i> 61 |
| 365 | ἀμβρότῳ, οἷα θεοὺς ἐπενήνοθεν αἰὲν ἑόντας, | = <i>HAp</i> 62 |
| | ἀμφὶ δὲ ἔμματα ἔσσαν ἐπήρατα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι. | cf. <i>Il.</i> 14.178 |

- And she went to Cyprus, Aphrodite lover of smiles,
to Paphos, where she has a precinct and a fragrant altar.
There the Graces washed her and anointed her with oil,
365 befitting a god, such as adorns the gods who are forever,
and they clothed her in lovely clothes, a wonder to behold.
(*Odyssey* 8.362–6)

- | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|
| | ἐς Κύπρον δ' ἐλθοῦσα θυώδεα νηὸν ἔδυνεν | cf. <i>Od.</i> 8.362 |
| | ἐς Πάφον· ἔνθα δέ οἱ τέμενος βωμός τε θυώδης· | = <i>Od.</i> 8.363 |
| 60 | ἐνθ' ἣ γ' εἰσελθοῦσα θύρας ἐπέθηκε φαεινάς. | = <i>Il.</i> 14.169 |
| | ἔνθα δέ μιν Χάριτες λούσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἐλαίῳ | = <i>Od.</i> 8.364 |
| | ἀμβρότῳ, οἷα θεοὺς ἐπενήνοθεν αἰὲν ἑόντας, | = <i>Od.</i> 8.365 |
| | ἀμβροσίῳ ἐ<δ>ανῶ, ² τό ῥά οἱ τεθυωμένον ἦεν. | = <i>Il.</i> 14.172 |

- She [sc. Aphrodite] went to Cyprus and entered the fragrant temple,
to Paphos, where she has a precinct and a fragrant altar;
60 there she entered and put to the shining doors.
There the Graces washed her and anointed her with oil,
befitting a god, such as adorns the gods who are forever,
ambrosial, sweet oil, which had been scented for her.
(*Hymn to Aphrodite* 58–64)

The similarities between the scenes can be variously explained. Most scholars posit a type-scene of seduction, female equivalent of an *aristeia* (for a woman, adornment is the prelude to seduction, as for a man arming is the prelude to prowess on the battlefield).³ Further instances cited include *Cypria* fr. 4–5

² The reading is discussed in § 5.7, p. 158 n. 62.

³ S. P. Morris 1992: 20: 'an arming scene in drag'; cf. Erbse 1970: 93; Lenz 1975: 126; Forsyth 1979; Smith 1981a: 41; Schwabl 1982: 16; Sowa 1984: 67–94, esp. 68–9 and 71–2; M. W. Edwards 1987a: 247–8; 1992: 312–13; Janko 1992: 170–1, 173–4; Alden 2000: 299; Kelly 2008: 294; Brillet-Dubois 2011: 109; Saïd 2011: 60.

Bernabé (Aphrodite's preparation for the Judgement of Paris), *Odyssey* XVIII (the beautification of Penelope before her appearance to the suitors), and Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days* (Pandora's beautification before her presentation to Epimetheus).⁴ The shared verses are then regarded as the traditional property of the type-scene.⁵

However, the recurrent language has very limited transferability. A phrase like 'ambrosial oil' applies only to a goddess's adornment.⁶ Other details are uniquely applicable to Aphrodite: only she will repair to Paphos and have her toilette performed there by the Graces (*Haph* and *Odyssey* VIII). Verses of such restricted application differ from the recurrent verses found in type-scenes of sacrifice or arming, which are transferable to any agent.⁷ Standardly a type-scene will describe 'recurrent actions of everyday life'; in this case the recurrent language is → character-specific and situation-specific.⁸ This problematizes the standard assumptions. It has been supposed that a type-scene of a goddess' toilette, kitted out with all the pertinent formulaic expressions, was a necessary part of the singer's repertoire.⁹ The difficulty, we have seen, is that many of the recurrent phrases pertain specifically to Aphrodite and are not applicable even to just any goddess. Some scholars have assumed a type-scene of the kind 'Aphrodite prepares to seduce X'.¹⁰ Yet it is questionable whether Aphrodite's lovers in early Greek hexameter poetry were numerous enough to warrant the type-scene. Moreover, this assumption now fails to account for the wider distribution of the toilette-and-seduction narrative sequence, whose attachment to Hera, Penelope, and Pandora as well as to Aphrodite is what suggested a type-scene in the first place.

Unless we take it as axiomatic that recurrence signifies typicality, our scenes from *Iliad* XIV, *Odyssey* VIII, and the *Hymn to Aphrodite* are just the kind of case where it makes sense to entertain a → specific reprise.¹¹ That is not to

⁴ *Od.* 18.192–4; *Hes. Th.* 573–89, *WD* 72–89.

⁵ Bierl 2012b: 127 n. 65: 'The reference ([*Od.*] 8.363–6) to the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite (58–63) should be evaluated less as marked intertextuality... than as a typical and ever recurring scene in the formulaic language of Homer with which the oral singer describes Aphrodite's homecoming and new erotic preparations.' Cf. Càssola 1975: 546; Pellizer 1978: 132; Hainsworth 1988: 371; Clay 1989: 171 n. 62; Janko 1992: 171; Breitenberger 2007: 51, 53; Brillet-Dubois 2011: 109–10. A revealingly mixed picture is given by Zanetto 1996: 286 (*Haph* 58–64 is a 'typical scene' using 'the traditional formulaic repertory', but also 'inspired by *Od.* 8.363–6'); Faulkner 2008: 3 n. 4, 32.

⁶ Steiner 2010: 186: 'regularly applied to the gods' possessions'. Cf. Risch 1965: 616.46–66; J. Griffin 1980a: 188; Janko 1992: 396.

⁷ Restricted applicability as implying non-typicality: Mueller 1984: 152–8; 2009: 156, 172.

⁸ Quotation from de Jong 2001: xix (this stipulation, however, is absent from the definitions of a type-scene by M. W. Edwards 1992: 285 and Gainsford 2003: 41 n. 3).

⁹ Pellizer 1978: 133. On associations of unique expressions for a unique character, cf. Di Benedetto 1994: 110.

¹⁰ Brillet-Dubois 2011: 110–11; Bierl 2012b: 127 n. 65, cited in note 5 above.

¹¹ Contrast Kelly 2008: 294: 'the toilet... is a narrative pattern of some frequency in early Greek epic poetry... This multiplicity of examples, and their essential structural similarity, argues for a typical "seduction" scene.'

deny that there may have been a type-scene of seduction in early Greek hexameter poetry (though the existence of such should not be taken for granted). The point is that a putative type-scene would not suffice to explain the similarities observable in our scenes; the recurrent features in which we are interested will be supervenient on any underlying typical structure. We consider next (§§ 5.2–5.5) whether it makes sense to interpret the data in terms of a series of specific reprises.¹²

5.2 *Iliad* XIV and *Odyssey* VIII

The *Odyssey* appears to be secondary to the *Iliad* (§ 2.1). This creates a presumption that Aphrodite's toilette in Demodokos' song of *Odyssey* VIII may be a reprise of Hera's toilette in *Iliad* XIV. W. Burkert argued that Demodokos' Song of Ares and Aphrodite reprises various scenes of divine burlesque in the *Iliad*: the deception of Zeus in book XIV, the quarrel in Olympus in book I, and the battle of the gods in book XXI.¹³ The inverse relationship between the *Dios apate* and Demodokos' song can, however, also be maintained (it being understood, here as elsewhere, that we are speaking of the relationship of motifs, not the specific passages themselves).¹⁴ Certain motifs are deployed in the Iliadic deception of Zeus in a manner that may be viewed as secondary to their deployment in *Odyssey* VIII.¹⁵ In particular, in Demodokos' song, Helios spies Ares and Aphrodite making love and informs Hephaistos, who tells all the other gods, who in turn come to see for themselves. In *Iliad* XIV, the same situation features merely as a feared eventuality in character-text (Hera: 'what if one of the everlasting gods should spy us as we sleep and should go and tell all the gods?'; Zeus: 'not even Helios could catch a glimpse of us', *Il.* 14.333–6, 344).¹⁶ On one view, Hera's professed fear alludes to a story where the eventuality was actually realized in the narrative, a possibility we encounter elsewhere in early Greek epic.¹⁷ To repeat: this would not require that *Iliad* XIV alludes to *Odyssey* VIII in particular: we are not obliged to think of a relationship between these specific texts. Lost narratives may intervene; thus it has been proposed that each of *Iliad* XIV and *Odyssey* VIII draws on earlier hexameter narratives about Aphrodite's marital/sexual relations with Hephaistos and/or Ares, and the story of Hephaistos'

¹² For different analyses in terms of specific reprises, see Lendle 1957: 39 n. 11, 115–16; Blümer 2001: ii.208–12.

¹³ Burkert 1960: 137–8 = 1997: 255–6. ¹⁴ → Motival priority.

¹⁵ M. W. Edwards 1987a: 250; Danek 1998a: 154. ¹⁶ Cf. Janko 1992: 205.

¹⁷ See § 4.3, on ⇒ *Il.* 24.735 and *Little Iliad* fr. 21.1–5 Bernabé (Andromache's fears for Astyanax in the *Iliad* as alluding to a situation narrated in the Cyclical epic; cf. Burgess 2012a: 181). Compare also *HHerm* 514–15 (Apollo fears that Hermes will steal his quiver; cf. N. J. Richardson 2010: 25 and 215). In general on the *Iliad*'s transformation of mythological facts into character psychology ('Psychologisierung des Faktischen'), cf. Kullmann 1960: 383–5; 1981: 26 = 1992: 85.

Return (a partially preserved narration of which is found in *HHom* 1) has been postulated as a source of each.¹⁸

For present purposes it is not crucial to determine the motival priority of *Iliad* XIV and *Odyssey* VIII relative to one another. More important is to acknowledge that *Iliad* XIV and *Odyssey* VIII each display an allusive character; it is this that makes the case for dependence arguable either way. Each exhibits a 'secondary' status relative to other (existing or conjectural) narratives. On the one hand, the *Dios apate* appears to allude to a range of traditional material.¹⁹ Particularly suggestive is the use of a lying tale: Hera's claim to be on the way to Okeanos and Tethys to patch up their matrimonial differences (lying tales appear to be used elsewhere to set off an innovative treatment against a traditional one).²⁰ On the other hand, Demodokos' song, as a → song within a song, seems to parade its own secondariness.²¹ It will be suggested presently that both can be regarded as secondary to (among others) a traditional hexameter narrative about the affair of Aphrodite and Anchises.

5.3 *Haph* and *Iliad* XIV

Most scholars have seen *Haph* 58–64 as imitating and conflating each of *Od.* 8.362–6 and *Il.* 14.166–72.²² That coheres with the view that *Haph* as a whole alludes to the *Iliad* and/or the *Odyssey*.²³ But again the converse motival priority can be maintained: that the attachment of the toilette-and-seduction motif to Aphrodite is prior to its attachment to Hera.²⁴ The following four considerations argue the priority of the association of the motif with Aphrodite.

First, a quantitative argument: of our three early Greek hexameter toilette-and-seduction narratives (*Odyssey* VIII, *Iliad* XIV, and *Haph*), two concern Aphrodite. We can add a third: the *Cypria* similarly describes Aphrodite's toilette in preparation for the Judgement of Paris (fr. 5 Bernabé).²⁵

¹⁸ Danek 1998a: 154–5; cf. Burkert 1960: 134–5 = 1997: 252–3 and nn. 8–9; Janko 1992: 192; M. L. West 2011a: 292–3; 2011c: 34–9; 2012: 239. For the reconstruction of *HHom* 1, see M. L. West 2001b and 2003c: 26–31.

¹⁹ Theogonic/cosmogonic poetry: *Il.* 14.201; cf. 15.187–93; Janko 1992: 180–1; cf. Burkert 1992: 91–2; differently, Kelly 2008: 275–81. Hymnic poetry: *Il.* 14.199. Material of *Cypria*: Janko 1992: 185. Herakles-saga: Erbse 1970: 94; M. L. West 2011a: 31 and n. 7, 36, 293.

²⁰ Hera's use of a lying tale: Burkert 2004: 30. Odysseus' 'Cretan tales', see § 2.2, pp. 47–8; cf. de Jong 2001: 326–8. 'Lying stories' as reflecting an alternative version: Finkelberg 2015: 130–1. In tragedy: Soph. *Phil.* 591–7, 603–21, evoking a traditional version (cf. *Little Iliad*, Summary, Bernabé p. 74 lines 6–8; Euripides' *Philoctetes*: Dio Chrys. 52.14) to contrast with the version dramatized; R. B. Rutherford 2012a: 360: 'we can observe that an alternative plot-path is not taken, and ... the dramatist makes sure we notice that'.

²¹ Cf. in general Krummen 2008.

²² Olson 2012: 168: 'A cento (patchwork) of lightly adapted verses and verse-fragments drawn from two erotic Homeric scenes', *ibid.* 17; cf. Allen, Halliday, and Sikes 1936: 356–7; Garvie 1994: 311; Baumbach 2012: 137. Cf. Faulkner 2008: 32, 142, 149; N. J. Richardson 2010: 29.

²³ *Haph* alludes to *Iliad*: e.g. Reinhardt 1956: 8, 11–12; Brillet-Dubois 2011. *Haph* alludes to *Odyssey*: e.g. Baumbach 2012: 139–41.

²⁴ Faulkner 2008: 32–3.

²⁵ M. L. West 2013: 75–6.

Second, a comparative argument: the antiquity of the motif's attachment to Aphrodite is suggested by Near Eastern (Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hittite) parallels, where toilette-and-seduction narratives are attached pre-eminently to the love goddess (Inanna, Ishtar, Shaushka).²⁶ Here, as elsewhere, Near Eastern literature may help adjudicate motival priority between early Greek hexameter texts.²⁷

Third, a qualitative argument: the scene may be felt to belong to Aphrodite in a way it does not to Hera.²⁸ Deception and seduction are obviously in keeping with the character and mythology of Aphrodite.²⁹ The seduction theme is also more obviously appropriate to two previously unacquainted persons (as Aphrodite and Anchises) than to wife and husband (Hera and Zeus).³⁰

Fourth, a metapoetic argument: the pointed inclusion of Aphrodite in the *Dios apate* (*Il.* 14.188–224) can be read as a → signal that this motif has been transferred from Aphrodite to Hera.³¹ The Iliadic Hera in borrowing Aphrodite's girdle metapoetically dons Aphrodite's mantle, much as Patroklos dons Achilles' armour in *Iliad* XVI to play a role properly belonging to Achilles (§ 2.3). A similar argument might be made for Penelope's toilette in *Odyssey* XVIII, preparatory to her coquettish appearance before the suitors: '[Athene] cleansed [Penelope's] face...with...ambrosial oil...such as the Lady of Kytheria...anoints herself with' (*Od.* 18.192–4). A motif that belongs to Aphrodite is here too arguably transferred to Penelope, and the transference signalled. There would be a nice irony in having the prudent Penelope, of all women, abetted by the chaste Athene, of all goddesses, in a toilette-and-flirtation sequence normally reserved for Aphrodite.³²

So there are grounds to say that *Haph* and *Iliad* XIV (and also *Odyssey* VIII) deploy a narrative sequence of restricted application that is properly attached to Aphrodite. In *Iliad* XIV its attachment to Hera (and likewise to Penelope in *Odyssey* XVIII) involves a pointed and allusive transference.

²⁶ Faulkner 2008: 33 n. 114.

²⁷ *Atrahasis* OBV I.352–60 = Foster 2005: 239 (motif of Enlil's plan to destroy early mankind in order to alleviate overpopulation) suggests the motival priority of ⇒ *Cypria* fr. 1.1–7 Bernabé over *Il.* 1.1–7 (motif of Zeus' plan to destroy heroes): Burkert 1992: 103 and 206–7 n. 9; 2004: 37–40; cf. Kirk 1972: 79; Scodel 1982: 47 and n. 37; Bremmer 2008: 109. *Ishtar's Descent* plays a comparable role in the argument of § 3.5, p. 91 n. 63.

²⁸ Faulkner 2008: 142; cf. 32–3.

²⁹ *Haph* 7, 33 ἀπατήσαι, 38 ἐξαπαφούσα; cf. Hes. *Th.* 205 ἀπάτας. Anastassiou 1969: 1003.18–25; W. A. Beck 1973: 1720.50–5, 1721.59–61. Cf. Sapph. fr. 1.2 Voigt, with Rissman 1983: 7–8; Soph. *Tr.* 500, with Easterling 1982: 135). For the verb used of Hera, note *Il.* 19.97, in addition to 14.160.

³⁰ Erbse 1970: 97: 'Here, die Göttin der Ehe und Keuschheit, rüstet sich, um ihren eigenen Gemahl mit erheuchelter Liebe zu umgarnen...!'

³¹ Cf. M. L. West 1978: 161–2; Faulkner 2008: 33; cf. Sowa 1984: 76; Brillet-Dubois 2011: 111.

³² Steiner 2010: 186: 'Athena's association with the cosmetics that more usually belong to Aphrodite is unparalleled in the archaic sources.'

5.4 *HApH* and *Odyssey* VIII

What then of the relationship between *Odyssey* VIII and the *Hymn to Aphrodite*? These share strikingly the motif of Aphrodite's toilette in Paphos (*Od.* 8.362–6, *HApH* 58–63). It is again difficult to establish the relationship between the specific extant texts. *HApH* has been assumed to be modelled on *Odyssey* VIII.³³ However, the converse motival relationship can, again, be maintained.³⁴ Suggestive here is the placement of the goddess' toilette at the end of Demodokos' song (*Od.* 8.362–6). The toilette more naturally belongs, of course, at the start of a seduction narrative. Its final position here seems to undermine closure, to intimate the possibility of Aphrodite starring in the future in another such episode of seduction.³⁵ In other words, Demodokos' song may play here with the audience's knowledge of other songs of Aphrodite's humiliating affairs, pre-eminent among which must have been her affair with Anchises.

5.5 *HApH*, *Cypria* fr. 5–7 Bernabé, *Iliad* XIV

Let us return to the relationship of *HApH* and the *Dios apate*. The narrative sequence is not just character-specific, it is also attached to a particular location: Mt Ida. Hera seduces Zeus on Mt Ida (*Il.* 14.157, 283), and Aphrodite seduces Anchises on Mt Ida, where she finds him herding (*HApH* 54, 68). We may call the latter a 'traditional' detail, in the sense that it has a clear prehistory in early Greek hexameter poetry (compare Hes. *Th.* 1010; *Il.* 2.821).³⁶ There is, however, nothing to suggest that sexual intercourse of Zeus and Hera on Mt Ida was similarly traditional.³⁷ One may wonder, therefore, whether the *Iliad* poet has located their intercourse on Mt Ida precisely to recall the traditional intercourse of Aphrodite and Anchises in the same location.³⁸

³³ Braswell 1981: 239 n. 8; Olson 2012: 16–17, 168–70; Baumbach 2012: 137–8; Hunter 2012: 94.

³⁴ M. L. West 2012: 227.

³⁵ Brillat-Dubois 2011: 112: 'getting provokingly ready for another round'. Cf. Sowa 1984: 76, 79–80, 91, 93; de Jong 2001: 209; Breitenberger 2007: 54; Hunter 2012: 91–2.

³⁶ Penglase 1994: 239.

³⁷ It is unknown whether there was intercourse between Zeus and Hera in the Herakles saga that apparently lies behind the *Dios apate* (cf. Erbse 1970: 94); even if there was, it is unlikely to have taken place on Mt Ida. The *ἱερὸς γάμος* of Zeus and Hera (Burkert 1985: 132; Janko 1992: 171) was not especially associated with Mt Ida.

³⁸ The *Iliad* situates Zeus on Mt Ida at 8.47 and again at 11.182. His position there is variously exploited. Cf. Janko 1992: 44, on *Il.* 13.10–12 (Poseidon on Samothrace, balancing Zeus on Ida): 'The picture of two gods watching from opposite mountain-tops is evocative'; 'such a detail is hardly traditional'; cf. *ibid.* 172, on *Il.* 14.153–8 (Hera on Olympus watching Zeus on Ida).

In fact, we know of two 'seductions' by Aphrodite on Mt Ida in early Greek hexameter poetry: her real seduction of Anchises, by whom she conceives a child, and a quasi-seduction of Paris, whom she effectively 'seduces' prior to the beauty contest between the goddesses. (Aphrodite can subsequently be taunted with being Paris' lover, *Il.* 3.406–9.)³⁹ The beauty contest took place on Mt Ida (compare *Il.* 24.29), and Aphrodite prepared for it as if for a seduction (*Cypria* frs. 5, 6–7 Bernabé).⁴⁰ Interestingly, in a late-attested tradition (Colluthus *Rape of Helen* 94–8), Aphrodite wore the κέστος (ἱμάς), 'girdle', referred to at *Iliad* 14.214–17; we can only guess whether she did so also in early (and pre-Homeric?) epic poetry.⁴¹ Aphrodite's seduction of Anchises and the quasi-seduction of Paris are clearly closely related; it may be idle to try to derive one from the other.⁴² We may, however, say that Aphrodite–Paris seems to employ the same motifs more obliquely than Aphrodite–Anchises. Thus, whereas Aphrodite–Anchises adopts more or less straightforwardly the Near Eastern motif (§ 5.8) of a sexual union between the love goddess and a royal personage securing the kingship for the goddess's favourite, Aphrodite–Paris inverts the motif: the favour of the love goddess now entails the loss of the kingdom. Now the Near Eastern motif is crossed with the folktale motif of the 'Hero's Choice of Life', so that the choice of the love goddess over the goddesses of kingship or warfare (cf. P. Oxy. 663.i.14–19; Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 3.2) becomes a catastrophic, rather than a salvific, choice.⁴³ In another twist, whereas Anchises (like his Sumerian counterparts, Dumuzi and the Ur III kings) beds the love goddess herself, Paris beds only Helene, and triggers the Trojan War by so doing. The way the Aphrodite-seduction motif works to the detriment of Paris and to the advancement of Anchises would be consistent with a theme of antagonism between these two branches of the Dardanos family that appears to surface at various points in the *Iliad* (13.459–61, 20.178–86, 300–8) and may belong to pre-Homeric tradition.

The *Iliad*, therefore, knows the mythology of both Aphrodite's quasi-seduction of Paris and her real seduction of Anchises; either or both could be the 'source' material signalled at *Iliad* 14.188–224. On the one hand, it would make sense to assume a dialogue between *Iliad* XIV and an early hexameter narrative of the Judgement of Paris, a kind of forerunner of the *Cypria*.⁴⁴ The

³⁹ Cf. Colluthus *Rape of Helen* 155–61.

⁴⁰ Cf. Soph. *Krisis* fr. 361 TGrF; Callim. *Bath of Pallas* 21–2.

⁴¹ Janko 1992: 185: 'Eustathius (979.61) guessed that Aphrodite wore this love-charm to Mt Ida for the judgement of Paris, a tale known to Homer (24.23–30) ... The plot of the *Cypria* surely inspired this episode.' Colluthus shows that Eustathius was not 'guessing'; Colluthus himself may or may not have been. Cf. Bär and Baumbach 2015: 621: 'With near certainty, Colluthus had no ... direct knowledge of Stasinus' *Cypria*.'

⁴² Cf. Stinton 1965: 62 = 1990: 64; Janko 1982: 152, 176–9; Clay 1989: 156–7.

⁴³ For P. Oxy. 663, see Bakola 2010: 323.

⁴⁴ Janko 1992: 185; Brillet-Dubois 2011: 111–12.

antagonistic relationship between Hera and Aphrodite in the *Dios apate* would take on an ironic resonance when viewed against the goddesses' antagonism in the Judgement: in the *Dios apate*, Hera turns the tables on her rival.⁴⁵ On the other hand, there is a very particular affinity between the *Dios apate* and Aphrodite's seduction of Anchises. Of the nine elements that make up the supposed type-scene of seduction, all nine are shared only by the *Dios apate* and the *Hymn to Aphrodite*.⁴⁶ And there are further similarities between these narratives of the seductions of Zeus and Anchises. First, the arousal of male desire on perceiving the goddess (*Haph* 91, *Il.* 14.294). Second, the phrase '[she/he] stood before him/her', of Aphrodite placing herself before Anchises (*Haph* 81) and of Zeus placing himself before Hera (*Il.* 14.297). And third, the extended dialogue, opened innocently enough by the male, answered by the goddess with a lying tale, answered in turn with the proposal of immediate sexual intercourse by the male (*Haph* 92–154, *Il.* 14.298–314), and finally resumed in hostile-minatory tone after a post-coital slumber (*Haph* 177–290, *Il.* 15.13–77), whereupon the goddess rather shamefacedly departs for Olympus (*Haph* 291, *Il.* 15.78–85).

Further to these similarities, there are reversals that are just as striking. First, in *Haph*, Aphrodite lies to and tricks Anchises in the course of her seduction of him; in the *Dios apate*, Aphrodite is herself lied to and tricked by Hera in the course of her seduction of Zeus. Second, in *Haph*, Zeus stands somewhat outside the action, but orchestrates it by implanting the initial desire in Aphrodite; in the *Dios apate*, Zeus is himself a participant in a seduction scene which is orchestrated by Hera. Third, *Haph* in narrator-text celebrates Aphrodite's power by recording how she beds Zeus with *mortal women*, making him forget Hera, most beautiful and noble of goddesses, his wedded wife (*Haph* 38–44); the *Dios apate* has Zeus declare in character-text that Hera, his wife, fills him at the present moment with greater desire than all his other lovers, proceeding to list the *mortal women* he has slept with (Dia, Danaë, Europe, Alkmene, and Semele), and then throwing in the goddesses to boot (Demeter, Leto, and, last, Hera herself: *Il.* 14.313–25). Fourth, *Haph* records, in narrator-text, how, apart from Athene, Artemis, and Hestia, Aphrodite deceives the mind of all other gods and men, 'even Zeus', whose wits she deceives 'whenever she wants to'; in the *Dios apate* Hypnos is made to declare, in character-text, that, apart from Zeus, he can put to sleep any other god, 'even Okeanos', but that he cannot put Zeus to sleep, 'unless he himself bids it' (*Il.* 14.244–8). Especially suggestive are the words with which Hera requests the girdle of Aphrodite in the *Dios apate*: 'give me Affection and Desire, with

⁴⁵ Reinhardt 1960 (1938): 27–30 = 1997: 181–4; Currie 2011: 63.

⁴⁶ Janko 1992: 170–1; cf. Sowa 1984: 71–2. The nine elements are: 1. motivation of the seductress, 2. her toilette, 3. her approach, 4. the male's reaction, 5. the seductress's false tale, 6. the male's desire; 7. removal of obstacles, 8. intercourse followed by sleep, 9. rude awakening.

which you subdue all immortals and mortal men' (*Il.* 14.198–9). These are close to the words used to celebrate Aphrodite's power at the beginning of *HAp*: 'she subdues the races of mortal men and airborne birds and all beasts' (3–4). The passages share a form of the verb 'subdue' (δαμνᾶν, ἐδαμάσσατο), a form of the adjective 'all' (πάντας, πάντα), and a polar expression involving 'mortal men' and 'immortals' or 'birds and beasts'.⁴⁷ The *Dios apate* here seems to deploy language deriving from a hymnic context.⁴⁸ The *Dios apate* seems to allude, with opposition in imitation, to *HAp* or something like it.

The *Dios apate* is a humorous episode whose effect depends in part on a contrast with the battle narrative.⁴⁹ But its humorous effect depends also on its allusive relationship with earlier poetry. R. Janko observed that in the *Dios apate* 'Homer parades his mastery of all of the other types of epic composition in his repertoire'.⁵⁰ That repertoire may be understood to include a Hymn to Aphrodite. The antagonism between Hera and Aphrodite in the *Dios apate* makes good sense against the mythological background of the Judgement of Paris, as we have seen. But it also makes excellent sense against the background, clearly discernible in the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, of a three-way antagonistic dynamic between Aphrodite as goddess of illicit sex, Hera as goddess of marriage and perennially deceived wife, and Zeus as perennially deceiving husband.

5.6 Pre-Homeric Hymnic Poetry to Aphrodite

HAp, according to the *communis opinio*, is 'later than Homer'.⁵¹ If so, the above analysis will require that there was hexameter poetry predating the *Iliad* which narrated the seduction in a manner close to that of *HAp*. It is clear in general that there were hexameter hymns older than our Homeric Hymns that covered the same mythological matter.⁵² We can reasonably infer that the union of Aphrodite and Anchises was narrated in hexameter poetry prior both to the *Iliad* and to Hesiod's *Theogony*.⁵³ There are allusions to that affair in

⁴⁷ Cf. Hes. *Th.* 121–2. ⁴⁸ Janko 1992: 180.

⁴⁹ See, e.g., Erbse 1970; Golden 1989. ⁵⁰ Janko 1992: 205.

⁵¹ Janko 1982: 180; cf. 2012: 21 and n. 3; Faulkner 2008: 47. Cf. Hoekstra 1969: 45–6; M. L. West 2012: 239. Doubts about the linguistic method of dating: e.g. Olson 2012: 10–15. Differently, for dependence of *Iliad* on *HAp*, see Blößner 2006: 36 and 42 (with references).

⁵² Janko 1992: 180, 221–2, 342; N. J. Richardson 2010: 29–30. Hesiod's *Theogony* implies 'hymns' to Persephone and Demeter (913–14), Aphrodite (1008–10), Hermes (938–9), etc.: N. J. Richardson 1974: 137. For predecessors of *HDem*, see § 3.1; of *HAp*, see N. J. Richardson 1974: 15; of *HHerm*, see M. L. West 2011c: 39 n. 22; 2002: 216–17 = 2011b: 404–5; 2012: 234; cf. N. J. Richardson 2010: 25.

⁵³ Reinhardt 1956: 7; Penglase 1994: 239. Differently, Olson 2012: 1; cf. 165; Baumbach 2012: 139. Non-committal: Faulkner 2008: 135–6.

both those poems.⁵⁴ The *Hymn to Aphrodite* makes elliptical reference to the punishment of Anchises (286–8), suggesting that it was a familiar detail.⁵⁵ We are able with some plausibility to identify the following five mythological elements, which recur at least once in early hexameter poetry, as being older than all our extant texts. First, that Aphrodite had intercourse with Anchises.⁵⁶ Second, that that intercourse took place on Mt Ida.⁵⁷ Third, that Anchises was herding when Aphrodite appeared to him.⁵⁸ Fourth, that Aphrodite conceived Aineias from this intercourse.⁵⁹ Fifth, Aineias and his descendants will enjoy divinely ordained sovereignty over the Trojans as a consequence of the affair.⁶⁰ The *Iliad* alludes to these five elements in diverse places: in books II, V, and XX. We should not be surprised, therefore, to find it drawing on pre-Homeric Aphrodite–Anchises poetry in book XIV as well.

5.7 A Neoanalytical Perspective

Let us review the argument so far. The story of the love affair of Aphrodite and Anchises, and the conception of Aineias, is likely to have been narrated in Greek hexameter poetry before the *Iliad*, most likely in pre-Homeric hymns to Aphrodite. The *Iliad* appears to interact with that pre-Homeric poetry at several points, notably in the *Dios apate*, which alludes otherwise to a wide range of pre-Homeric hexameter poetry. The *Iliad* signals, via the motif of the borrowed girdle, that Aphrodite is Hera's model in her seduction of Zeus on Mt Ida. The narrative of the *Dios apate* might allude to pre-Homeric hexameter narratives of Aphrodite seducing Anchises on Mt Ida or of Aphrodite 'seducing' Paris on Mt Ida or both. The *Dios apate* can be argued to invert various motifs found in *Haph*. It is tempting to see the *Iliad* as alluding to pre-Homeric hymnic poetry to Aphrodite. Tempting and, of course, problematic: if the *Iliad* depends not directly on *Haph*, but on one or more forerunner(s) of the *Hymn*, then it is unclear how far we are entitled to see the *Iliad* as responding to specific details of *Haph*. It is purely a matter for conjecture how close, especially in matters of detail, the putative forerunner(s) can have been to *Haph*.⁶¹ We run up here

⁵⁴ *Il.* 2.819–21; cf. 5.247–8, 5.313, 20.208; Hes. *Th.* 1008–10 (for the verses' authenticity, see G. P. Edwards 1971: 198–9; Dräger 1997: 1–26).

⁵⁵ Anchises' punishment: Soph. *Laocoon* fr. 373.1–3 TGrF; Hygin. *Fab.* 94; Serv. on Virg. *Aen.* 2.649. Cf. J. Griffin 1992: 202. It possibly featured in the *Iliou Persis*: Rossbach 1893–4: 2107.19–32; Stinton 1965: 50–1 = 1990: 55; Faulkner 2008: 296; N. J. Richardson 2010: 243.

⁵⁶ Hes. *Th.* 1009; *Il.* 2.821; *Haph*, *passim*.

⁵⁷ Hes. *Th.* 1010; *Il.* 2.822; *Haph* 54.

⁵⁸ *Il.* 5.313; *Haph* 54–5, 76–80.

⁵⁹ Hes. *Th.* 1008; *Il.* 2.821, 5.247–8 ~ 20.208, 5.313; *Haph* 196, 255.

⁶⁰ *Il.* 20.302–8; *Haph* 196–7. M. W. Edwards 1991: 298–301; M. L. West 2003a: 15–16.

⁶¹ For reflections on where *Haph* may have been innovative, see Faulkner 2008: 135–6.

again against the perennial problem of the unknowable degree of textual fixity in the early Greek epic tradition.

Even if the motival priority of *Haph* to the *Dios apate* and the *Iliad*'s inversion of various motifs of *Haph* are conceded, the phraseology that is shared between the two poems remains a special problem. The phraseology in question is the following. First, in the description of the goddesses' toilette: 'there she entered and laid to the shining doors', 'with oil, / ambrosial, sweet (?) oil, which had been scented for her'.⁶² Second, in announcing the arrival on Mt Ida of the goddess: '[Aphrodite / Hera] came to craggy Ida, mother of beasts'.⁶³ And third, in reporting the prophecy concerning Aineias' descendants (in *Haph* and *Iliad* XX): '[Aineias] will rule among the Trojans ... and his children's children'.⁶⁴ According to the view that *Haph* is simply secondary to the *Iliad*, the shared phrasing can be straightforwardly explained as borrowings by the hymn from the Homeric epic(s).⁶⁵ On the view that the *Dios apate* interacts with a forerunner of *Haph*, the question rises whether there is scope to see the *Iliad* as quoting, verbatim and nearly verbatim, earlier poetry on the affair of Aphrodite and Anchises. Those quotations would be detectable for us because *Haph* more or less faithfully preserves those verses and phraseology from the earlier poetry on the affair of Aphrodite and Anchises. That position is, of course, in general problematic.⁶⁶ It asks us to accept the possibilities both of *Haph* taking over phrasing from older hymnic poetry to Aphrodite and of the *Iliad* taking over phrasing from earlier hexameter poetry. The former invites comparison with the possibility that *HDem* took over phrasing from an older Hymn to Demeter (discussed in §§ 3.1, 3.3). The latter possibility has often been mooted (it was explored in §§ 2.3 and 4.3), but is impossible to prove.⁶⁷

⁶² *Haph* 60 = *Il.* 14.169 ἐνθ' ἣ γ' εἰσελθοῦσα θύρας ἐπέθηκε φαεινὰς (a 'formula' of Indo-European derivation, according to Boedeker 1974: 77). *Haph* 63 = *Il.* 14.172 (sc. ἐλαίῳ) ἀμβροσίῳ ἐ(δ)ανῶ, τό ρά οἱ τεθυωμένον ἦεν. The mss. of *Haph* have ἐανῶ / ἐανῶ, '(sc. oil) for her ambrosial dress', those of *Iliad* XIV ἐδανῶ, 'ambrosial, sweet (? cf. Beekes 2010: i.373) (sc. oil)'. The variation ἐδανῶ / ἐανῶ is probably due to error (scribal? rhapsodic?). It is unclear which reading is to be preferred: see, variously, Janko 1982: 161; 1992: 175; Faulkner 2008: 146–8; Olson 2012: 173.

⁶³ *Haph* 68 ~ *Il.* 14.283 Ἰδην δ' ἰκέσθην (ἵκανον) πολυπίδακα μητέρα θηρῶν. *Il.* 14.283 = 15.151 (on the manuscript variation ἰκέσθην / ἵκανον, see Haslam 1997: 97–8). Differently on these verses, Olson 2012: 174.

⁶⁴ ⇒ *Haph* 196–7 σοὶ δ' ἔσται φίλος υἱὸς δὲ ἐν Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει / καὶ παῖδες παῖδεσσι διαμπερὲς ἐγγεγάονται ~ *Il.* 20.307–8 νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαιο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει / καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοῖ κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.

⁶⁵ See esp. Olson 2012: 16–20, 168–70, 232.

⁶⁶ Cf. Erbse 1993: 394; Kelly 2006: 23.

⁶⁷ Apart from ⇒ 18.26 and ⇒ 24.735, the *Iliad* has been argued to take over phrasing from earlier poetry at, e.g., 9.381 (Hainsworth 1993: 113; M. L. West 1995: 211 = 2011: 198 n. 29); 18.39–49 (M. W. Edwards 1991: 149; cf. J. T. Kakridis 1949: 75); 22.71–6 (M. L. West 2011a: 36, 385; N. J. Richardson 1993: 113; de Jong 2012: 75–6); 23.14 (J. T. Kakridis 1949: 84; Dowden 1996: 59). In general: Danek 2002b: 17; cf. R. L. Fowler 2004: 229–30.

It will be obvious that these arguments are analogous with neoanalytical arguments concerning the relationship between the *Iliad* and Cyclical epics such as the *Cypria*, *Aethiopis*, or *Little Iliad*.⁶⁸ It is clear that there were Trojan War epics predating the *Iliad*, and it is a premise of neoanalysis that the 'Cyclical' epics, even if later than the *Iliad*, dealt with the same mythological matter as those pre-Iliadic epics.⁶⁹ Neoanalysts characteristically argue that the *Iliad* has transferred motifs from their original contexts in pre-Homeric poetry to new contexts, but that those older contexts are sometimes still discernible, thanks to the Cyclical epics. The argument for transferred phraseology is even more controversial than for transferred motifs, but it has been made, notably for the proems of the *Iliad* and the *Cypria* (*Il.* 1.3–5, *Cypria* fr. 1.6–7 Bernabé: see § 1.1) and for the depictions of the killing of Astyanax in the *Iliad* and the *Little Iliad* (*Il.* 24.735, *Little Iliad* fr. 29.4 Bernabé: see § 4.3).

According to the above analysis, the *Iliad* interacts with earlier hymnic poetry to Aphrodite on the levels of narrative structure, motif, and, conceivably, phrasing. This argument presumes interaction with something like an integral poem: something with a considerable degree of fixity, not a 'song-tradition', in the sense of a succession of songs freely recomposed on each occasion. Conversely, the relationship of *Haph* and the *Iliad* has been viewed as one of overlapping 'traditions', not texts.⁷⁰ According most recently to P. Brillet-Dubois, 'the hymnic and the heroic traditions'—i.e., the traditions that gave rise respectively to *Haph* and the *Iliad*—'developed simultaneously in a fruitful dialogue, defining their themes and poetics in relation to each other'.⁷¹ This argument for 'intertraditionality' (see § 1.4) is not intrinsically implausible. Yet the most marked and meaningful allusions involve seeing *Haph* as motivally prior to the *Iliad* and seeing the *Iliad* as alluding to (a forerunner of) *Haph*. Above all, the *Iliad* itself authorizes that way of viewing the relationship, in signalling its transference of the toilette-and-seduction motif from Aphrodite to Hera. Here, as elsewhere, specific unidirectional allusion between (relatively) fixed texts seems the more significant phenomenon than possible bidirectional intertextuality between evolving song-traditions.

There are other ways, too, of making sense of the data. Thus, it would be possible to see *Haph* as motivally prior to the *Iliad*, but as deriving its phrasing from the Homeric poems (*Iliad* XIV, XX, and *Odyssey* VIII). *Haph* would

⁶⁸ Burgess 2001: *passim*; 2006a.

⁶⁹ Succinctly summarized by R. L. Fowler 2004: 228.

⁷⁰ Cf. Nagy 1979: 267 n. 7, against the assumption of 'interrelationships of texts rather than traditions' in relation to *Haph* and *Iliad*; cf. *ibid.* 269: 'the *Iliad* and the *Hymn to Aphrodite* traditions'.

⁷¹ Brillet-Dubois 2011: 132; cf. 131: 'creative and subtle interaction existed between well-established Aphroditic and Iliadic traditions'.

then emerge as a kind of → cento.⁷² In § 4.3 we saw that it was possible to take a similar view of the relationship of *Little Iliad* fr. 21.3–4 Bernabé and *Iliad* 6.467 and 24.735. The ‘cento approach’ is a distinct possibility. But, as was argued in Chapter 4, if we are to think of other early Greek hexameter poetry as interacting with the Homeric poems in so textualized a way (and *HApH* is regarded as one of the earliest Greek hexameter compositions), then it seems the Homeric epics should be allowed in principle a similar ability to engage with earlier poetry, likewise conceivable as relatively fixed texts, whether purely oral or not. Other things being equal, it would be more economical to postulate a single source for both motifs and phrasing than separate ones (as the ‘cento’ approach requires).

A further possibility is that the coincidence in phrasing in these passages is the result of concordance interpolation.⁷³ But it is hard to think of our passages as having been inserted en bloc from one context to another; the goddess’s toilette per se can hardly be regarded as a wholly extraneous insertion in any of *Iliad* XIV, *Odyssey* VIII, and *HApH*. On a smaller scale, ancient editorial activity may be suspected of bringing the phrasing of one passage into line with another. A weak indication of this would be the possible ‘correction’ (in some manuscripts) of *Iliad* 14.172 ἔδανῶ by collation with *HApH* 64 ἐανῶ. However, the counter-case of *Iliad* 20.308 καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται and *HApH* 197 καὶ παῖδες παῖδεσσι διαμπερὲς ἐκγεγάονται suggests that the transmission cannot have been overly concerned to bring the wording of the passages into conformity with each other.

The situation, therefore, is, typically, not clear-cut: the possibility that the poet of the *Iliad* alludes with verbatim quotation to earlier poetry on the seduction of Anchises by Aphrodite can be taken seriously, but must be recognized to jostle with alternative interpretations.

II. A SUMERIAN–AKKADIAN–GREEK TRANSFERENCE: INANNA, ISHTAR, APHRODITE

5.8 Dumuzi–Inanna Songs and the *Hymn to Aphrodite*

The first part of this chapter (§§ 5.1–5.7) argued that the neoanalytical debate may be enlarged synchronically by considering as potential indirect ‘sources’ of the *Iliad* not just the lost poems of the Epic Cycle, but also other early Greek hexameter poetry such as the *Hymn to Aphrodite*. The argument of this second

⁷² Olson 2012: 168.

⁷³ See in general Janko 1992: Index s.v. ‘interpolation, concordance’.

part (§§ 5.8–5.11) is that Near Eastern poetry offers us the chance to enlarge that debate diachronically. Of special interest here is Sumerian poetry of the late third or early second millennium, nearly forty short compositions making up a corpus of Dumuzi–Inanna songs.⁷⁴ These songs were apparently meant for performance, though their actual performative context, if any, at the time of the extant manuscripts is unclear.⁷⁵ They feature lengthy descriptions of the goddess Inanna's toilette and dressing before she meets her beloved, Dumuzi; their meeting is the prelude to sexual intercourse, either narrated explicitly or just anticipated in the text.⁷⁶

A related contemporary group of texts are Royal Hymns, in which Inanna's toilette and dressing are described in preparation for a sexual rendezvous with Sumerian kings, most notably *Shulgi X* (for King Shulgi of the Third Ur dynasty, c.2094–2047 BC) and *Iddindagan A* (for King Iddindagan of the Isin dynasty, c.1953–1935 BC). The *Sitz im Leben* envisaged by these texts appears to be a 'sacred marriage' rite at a New Year festival; the ritual may or may not have been real.⁷⁷ This sexual rendezvous of Inanna with the king in the Royal Hymns is evidently modelled on the mythical archetype of Inanna's sexual rendezvous with Dumuzi. The king may be explicitly identified with Dumuzi.⁷⁸ Shulgi is called 'the shepherd Dumuzi' in *Shulgi X* and Iddindagan is called Ama-ushumgal-ana (an alias of Dumuzi) in *Iddindagan A*.⁷⁹ Thus, the motival posterity of the Royal Hymns to the Dumuzi–Inanna mythology can be said to be written into the texts themselves.⁸⁰

There is, then, in Sumerian poetry of the third–second millennium a recurring narrative sequence of female toilette followed by sexual intercourse, just as there is in Greek hexameter poetry of the first millennium. The implications of this coincidence must be considered. If we assumed that there was a typical scene of seduction in Sumerian and Greek hexameter

⁷⁴ Edition, with English translation and commentary: Sefati 1998; see also *ETCSL* 4.08.01–4.08.33. Sefati 1998: 18 estimates the corpus as comprising approximately 1,700 lines from 38 songs.

⁷⁵ Various identified in Sumerian as *balbale*, *širnamšub*, *tigi*, *kunġar*: Sefati 1998: 21–49; Lapinkivi 2004: 1, 243. The Dumuzi–Inanna songs as providing prototypes for wedding rites: Alster 1985; Leick 1994: 64–79; as providing prototypes for the 'sacred marriage' rite celebrated by the king (impersonating Dumuzi) and a priestess (impersonating Inanna): Sefati 1998: 18–19, 21, 30–49; Lapinkivi 2004: 1–2; cf. 12–13, 14–15, 241–2.

⁷⁶ Sefati 1998: 104: 'After the bride bathes, adorns herself, and opens the door for the groom, who knocks at it..., comes the sexual union of the couple. The episode is not equally developed in all of the cultic marriage songs, and a number of short songs do not mention it explicitly, though there can be no doubt that it did in fact take place.'

⁷⁷ Public festival: Cooper 1993: 81, 92–3. Near Year festival: Fritz 2003: 314–15 (see *ibid.* 319–25 for the reconstruction of the festival). On the question whether there was a real 'sacred marriage' ritual, cf. Sallaberger 1999: 155–6; P. Jones 2003. In general, on the 'sacred marriage': Sefati 1998: 30–49; Haas 1999: 122–6; Lapinkivi 2004: *passim*.

⁷⁸ Lapinkivi 2004: 186, 242, 245. Differently, Fritz 2003: 318–19.

⁷⁹ Cooper 1993: 87. Cf. also *Urnamma A* 213–15; *ETCSL* 2.4.1.1; Flückiger-Hawker 1999: 138, 180–1. The names of Dumuzi: Alster 1999a: 830; Krebernik 2003.

⁸⁰ Cf. Flückiger-Hawker 1999: 86–7.

poetry, then it could be supposed that the typical scene arose independently in each tradition, in the same kind of way that we can suppose typical scenes of 'assembly', 'arming', etc., to have arisen independently in Greek and South Slavic poetic traditions.⁸¹ However, we have seen reason to be dissatisfied with the ascription of the recurrence of the seduction narrative in early Greek hexameter poetry simply to the workings of a typical scene. It is not easy to put the recurrence of the seduction narrative in Sumerian poetry down to the workings of a typical scene, either; they are likewise → character-specific and situation-specific, restricted to the context of the 'marriage' either of Inanna with Dumuzi or of Inanna with a king who explicitly plays the part of Dumuzi.⁸² While there is no especial difficulty in thinking that two distinct oral poetic traditions could have developed a type-scene of seduction independently of each other, the assumption here does little to explain the strikingly restricted distribution of the toilette-and-seduction sequence. Moreover, the number, detail, and specificity of the correspondences between the Sumerian Dumuzi-Inanna songs and *HApH* seem to go well beyond what can be expected of the independent operation of type-scenes of seduction within two poetic traditions; consider the following correspondences. First, the characters in each narrative are the goddess of love (Inanna, Aphrodite) and her lover, characterized as a shepherd or herdsman (Dumuzi, Anchises).⁸³ Second, the venue for their erotic encounter is the sheepfold or the cattle pen.⁸⁴ Third, the love goddess's toilette and her dressing are described at length.⁸⁵ Fourth, the love goddess adorned in her finery at the moment of the encounter with her lover is likened through a simile to the moon.⁸⁶ Fifth, the encounter

⁸¹ Homeric 'typical scenes' common to South Slavic (and other) oral poetic traditions: Schwabl 1990: 93, 100; Garvie 1994: 5; cf. Lord 1960: 68–98; Danek in Katičić 1998: 42–4; J. M. Foley 1999: 94–8; cf. *ibid.* 83–6, comparing typical scenes of Homeric and South Slavic heroic poetry. Cf. in general Heubeck 1974: 133: 'Wo immer und wann immer heroische Poesie zu beobachten ist, stets folgt sie ganz bestimmten Gesetzen, derart, daß man, da gegenseitige Beeinflussung oder Abhängigkeit in den meisten Fällen ausgeschlossen werden darf, geradezu von Elementarparallelen sprechen kann.'

⁸² Considered a 'type-scene' by Walls 2001: 35; Dumas-Reungoat 2010: 160.

⁸³ Dumuzi as shepherd: Leick 1994: 69, 87; Sefati 1998: 78, 108. Cf. *Gilg.* SBV VIII.149–50. Black et al. 2004: 206; Foster 2005: 167 no. II.19(c), 1025 no. IV.61. The king may be metaphorically a 'shepherd' in Sumerian literature: Reisman 1969: 17–18 and nn. 61, 63, 64; Cooper 1993: 91. Inanna's betrothed is clearly often understood literally to be a shepherd: e.g. *The Shepherd and the Farmer* Sefati 1998: 324–42 = *ETCSL* 7.4.08.33. Anchises as shepherd: *HApH* 54–5, 76–80; cf. 160, 168–9; *Il.* 5.313; Stinton 1965: 50–1, 59–60 = 1990: 55, 62; J. Griffin 1992: 196.

⁸⁴ Inanna and Dumuzi: *Dumuzi-Inanna* V 4–5 (Sefati 1998: 257); cf. *Ishme-Dagan J*; *Dumuzi-Inanna R* Source A 27–8, Source C 15'–16' (Sefati 1998: 239–40). For the various locations of the intercourse between Dumuzi and Inanna, see Lapinkivi 2004: 79–80. Aphrodite and Anchises: *HApH* 76, 79.

⁸⁵ Sefati 1998: 98–9.

⁸⁶ Inanna: *Dumuzi-Inanna* C₁ ii.20: 'like a moonbeam'. Sefati 1998: 286–300 = *ETCSL* 4.08.29 B12–23. The subject of the main verb (Inanna or Dumuzi?) is uncertain, and hence also the simile's referent: Sefati 1998: 298. Dumuzi as referent of a similar simile: *Dumuzi-Inanna* V 8

between the lovers is narrated quasi-dramatically through dialogue.⁸⁷ Sixth, this encounter is not simply a lovers' tryst, but a betrothal.⁸⁸ Seventh, the encounter-cum-betrothal proceeds, with almost indecent haste, to sexual intercourse, more or less explicitly narrated.⁸⁹ Finally, these poetic narratives of the sexual union between the goddess of love and her human lover, the shepherd, could apparently be used in both their Sumerian and Greek contexts with an ideological purpose, to give support to rulers.⁹⁰ We have here, then, numerous detailed and specific correspondences, embracing form, content, and function.

M. L. West posited influence at only a very general level, suggesting that these scenes from the Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna songs, the Sumerian Royal Hymns, and *HApH* should be seen as instances of a 'genre scene' of 'dressing' common to both Greek and Near Eastern poetry.⁹¹ Accordingly, the use of genre scenes (West cites 'feasting' and 'chariot journeys' as further examples) is one of several narrative features that Greek hexameter poetry took from Near Eastern poetry. However, the similarities between the Greek and Near Eastern 'toilette-and-seduction' sequence are, precisely, non-generic: we have seen that they are specific to a high degree. There is a case for a specific dependence here, of the kind that West envisages elsewhere for Greek and Near Eastern poetry.

This situation poses a very characteristic dilemma. On the one hand, it seems inconceivable how a plurality of short lyrical poems in Sumerian of the late third millennium BC can have influenced a Greek hexameter hymn of the seventh century BC. On the other hand, it is hard to conceive how the similarities could otherwise be explained. Clearly, a case for influence cannot posit direct influence between extant texts; the extant texts can only serve to adumbrate the hypothetical 'texts', oral or written, now lost, that might once have served as direct models.⁹² Even so, to consider the Dumuzi–Inanna songs

'Dumuzi [came forth] like the daylight' (Sefati 1998: 257); cf., of Inanna, *Iddindagan A* 199 'She [Inanna] comes forth like daylight from the side of the throne' (trans. Reisman 1969: 176) or 'She shines like daylight on the great throne dais' (trans. Black et al. 2004: 267). Aphrodite: *HApH* 89–90 ὥς δὲ σελήνη. It is unclear whether Aphrodite is the subject of *HApH* 90 ἐλάμπετο (against: Faulkner 2008: 171). *HApH* and the Sumerian texts are connected by Henrichs 1972: 22; M. L. West 1978: 161; 1997: 204; Penglase 1994: 174; Faulkner 2008: 20–1, 170–1.

⁸⁷ e.g. *Dumuzi-Inanna B*, *Dumuzi-Inanna C* (Sefati 1998: 138–9 and, in general, 24, 58); *HApH* 91–154.

⁸⁸ e.g. *Dumuzi-Inanna C₁* (in general: Sefati 1998: 97–107); *HApH* 126–42.

⁸⁹ e.g. *Dumuzi-Inanna C₁* ii.21–2 (Sefati 1998: 104–7); *HApH* 166–7.

⁹⁰ See, on the Sumerian side, esp. *Dumuzi-Inanna D₁*. *HApH* 196–7 appears to support a dynasty of 'Aineiadaï'.

⁹¹ M. L. West 1997: 203–5; cf. Hunter 2012: 94. Other Near Eastern and Greek texts taken to exemplify this 'genre scene' are the Babylonian *Nergal and Ereshkigal* and *Gilgamesh*, the Hittite *Hedammu* and *Ullikummi*, and *Odyssey* VIII: M. L. West 1997: 204 n. 108; cf. S. P. Morris 1997: 617. It is not clear that any of these are 'typical' scenes, as § 5.14 will attempt to clarify.

⁹² In general, Henkelman 2006: 810; 2010: 323–4; Rollinger 2011: 218, 219; cf. George 2003: i.56.

as a 'source' of *HApH* raises immediate problems.⁹³ For one thing, the Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna songs do not present anything like a fixed text; there is no single version of 'Dumuzi–Inanna' to set against *HApH*.⁹⁴ Another problem is whether we can assume a tradition of the Dumuzi–Inanna love songs or the Royal Hymns into the first millennium BC, or even much beyond the end of the third.⁹⁵ More generally, any argument for the influence of Sumerian poetry on Greek poetry poses problems, given the early obsolescence of Sumerian as a spoken language.⁹⁶ A further problem concerns the transfer from a cuneiform culture to a non-cuneiform culture.⁹⁷ Yet it would be a mistake to conceive of Mesopotamian cuneiform culture as a world unto itself. Mesopotamian literature was not, in the first centuries of the first millennium BC, written solely either in the medium of cuneiform clay tablets or in the Sumerian and Akkadian languages. Perishable materials (papyrus, parchment, leather rolls) and, increasingly, Aramaic were used in parallel with Sumerian and Akkadian cuneiform.⁹⁸ Even more evanescent than those materials is the oral transmission that is likely to have accompanied the written transmission.⁹⁹ Bilingualism or multilingualism are a prerequisite of transfer across language barriers; but this is very largely a given in the ancient Near East.¹⁰⁰ We may conceive of Sumerian literature, oral or written, as being mediated by Akkadian in the first instance, with Aramaic and/or Phoenician as possible further intermediaries, and thus being eventually received in archaic Greek contexts.¹⁰¹

⁹³ See, with differing levels of scepticism, Penglas 1994: 165; Faulkner 2008: 135; cf. 19–22; Boedeker 1974: 64, 67; Clay 1989: 153 n. 2.

⁹⁴ Lane Fox 2008: 244: 'The texts which survive are telling a story, not repeating the fixed version of a single "myth".'

⁹⁵ Röllig 2001: 312–13: 'It is evident that [almost all the great Sumerian compositions] were unknown in the second half of the second millennium and of course not a part of the tradition during the first millennium. Such compositions cannot be considered in the context of the transmittal of oriental motifs into the Greek world ... There are no traces of an oral tradition of such texts, and we have to conclude that not only the specific formulations but also the entire content of these texts did not survive.'

⁹⁶ See, however, J. Griffin 1992: 206–11. On the obsolescence of spoken Sumerian, by the middle of the second millennium BC or earlier, see Michalowski 2004: 19.

⁹⁷ For the gulf between Greek and cuneiform literature, see Foster 2007: 1. Greeks did not read cuneiform: Lambert 1991: 114; Edmunds 2005: 34; Lane Fox 2008: 355; M. L. West 2014: 31; differently (heterodoxly), Teodorsson 2006: 172.

⁹⁸ Burkert 1992: 30–1; M. L. West 1997: 592; Rollinger 2011: 217. Cf. Radner and Robson 2011: Index s.vv. 'Aramaic' and 'writing boards'.

⁹⁹ Doubts about whether there was 'any oral background for Mesopotamian literature': Foster 2007: 49; cf. Vanstiphout 1986: 227–8. In favour generally of a Mesopotamian oral tradition: M. L. West 1997: 593–606; Sasson 2005: 224; Henkelman 2006: 813–14. For *Gilgamesh*, in particular: Henkelman 2006; Steymans 2010: 335; Bachvarova 2016: 54 n. 2. For Assyrian royal inscriptions: Patzek 2011: 394.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Sasson 2005: 216; Schwemer 2006: 274; Frahm 2011: 17; Haubold 2013a: 23.

¹⁰¹ M. L. West 1997: 62. Cf. Burkert 1979a: 109, 110. On the possibility that the Babylonian *Gilgamesh* came to Greece in the Phoenician or Aramaic languages, cf. George 2003: i.56; cf. Burkert 2004: 48: 'via Aramaic versions'; further M. L. West 1997: 627–9. Foster 2007: 115; De Breucker 2011: 638.

As luck would have it, we have tantalizing evidence of an Akkadian tradition of Ishtar–Dumuzi ‘songs’ (Akkadian *zamārū*) in the late second or first millennia BC. A Middle Babylonian poem with the incipit *Erbamma rē’ū* (‘Come in, Shepherd’) is fragmentarily preserved (Foster no. II.19.(c)).¹⁰² It appears to have been a narrative poem composed in Akkadian’s ‘so-called “hymnic-epic” literary dialect’ and to have comprised much direct speech.¹⁰³ A Middle Assyrian catalogue documents the presence of this poem and several like it in a royal library in Assur in the late second or early first millennium BC.¹⁰⁴ This evidence, scanty as it is, authorizes the surmise of a much fuller literary tradition at the time.¹⁰⁵ The elliptical style of *Erbamma rē’ū* is consistent with this.¹⁰⁶ The continuance of the Sumerian third-millennium Dumuzi–Inanna tradition into Akkadian and into the second–first millennium thus seems assured.¹⁰⁷

The transfer of Dumuzi–Inanna mythology from the Near East into the first-millennium Greek world remains to account for. That such a transfer did occur is indicated by the links attested in the seventh century BC between Dumuzi (Tammuz) and the Greek Adonis. The women’s lament raised for Adonis on Lesbos (Sappho fr. 140 and 168 Voigt) corresponds to *Gilg.* SBV VI.46 and Exekiel 8:14 (Tammuz).¹⁰⁸ Tammuz and Astarte are prominent among Phoenician deities naturalized respectively in Greek as Adonis and Aphrodite.¹⁰⁹ Both Aphrodite and Adonis are strongly associated with Cyprus, where Greek and Phoenician cultures mingled. A mythological tradition from Mt Eryx in Sicily is recorded in the first century BC by Diodorus, himself a Sicilian, according to which the hero Eryx was a son of Aphrodite and Boutes, the local king (Diod. 4.23.2).¹¹⁰ Diodorus’ sparse details imply a narrative in which Aphrodite has sexual intercourse with a local king (with the speaking name *Βούτης*, ‘Herdsman’), and bares a son who becomes the eponymous hero of the region—much as Aineias, the son of Aphrodite and ‘herdsman’ Anchises, becomes the eponymous archegete of a dynasty of ‘Aineiadaí’.¹¹¹ It is suggestive here that Sicilian Mt Eryx, another mixed

¹⁰² Black 1983: 34; MB or very late OB; Foster’s ‘Classical Period’, 1850–1500 BC. Lapinkivi 2004: 58.

¹⁰³ Black 1983: 32. Not lyric: *ibid.* 29–30; secular: *ibid.* 28–9.

¹⁰⁴ KAR 158. See Ebeling 1922; Black 1983: 25–9 (25 n. 3 on the date); Lapinkivi 2004: 59. *Erbamma rē’ū* is quoted by its incipit at KAR 158 i.6.

¹⁰⁵ Black 1983: 29; Cooper 1993: 94–5. Cf., on the problem in general, Foster 2007: 7.

¹⁰⁶ Black 1983: 30.

¹⁰⁷ Cooper 1993: 94–5; Sefati 1998: 46–7; Lapinkivi 2004: 14, 29. Differently, Leick 1994: 104, 182; Fritz 2003: 328.

¹⁰⁸ Burkert 1979a: 106–7; M. L. West 1997: 57; Lane Fox 2008: 245–6, 250–1.

¹⁰⁹ S. P. Morris 1992: 112–13. Cf. M. L. West 1997: 56.

¹¹⁰ Other reflections of the myth: Σ Theocr. 15.100–1; Hygin. *Fab.* 260, etc.: Lietz 2012: 184 n. 16.

¹¹¹ Allen, Halliday, and Sikes 1936: 349.

Phoenician-Greek milieu, throws up another Greek version of the Inanna-Dumuzi complex.¹¹² We are encouraged in this instance, therefore, to think of Phoenicians as cultural intermediaries.¹¹³ The precise mechanics of the transfer, of course, elude us, and need not concern us here; it is enough to know that there is at least one historically plausible channel of transmission.

The claim that the Sumerian songs are an indirect 'source' of *Haph* should not be taken for a variety of the genetic fallacy, a quest for origins which tells us nothing about the contemporary significance of the *Hymn*.¹¹⁴ Rather, it enables us to see *Haph* as attempting something approximating to 'translation', a pointed and creative attempt to render a Near Eastern myth in native Greek terms.¹¹⁵ In *Haph*, Aphrodite's physical union with Anchises serves as an *aition* for the perpetual sovereignty of his bloodline in the Troad (*Haph* 196–7; compare *Il.* 20.302–8).¹¹⁶ It is likely that we are dealing with a legitimizing myth for a contemporary ruling dynasty somewhere in the Troad.¹¹⁷ Likewise, in the Sumerian Royal Hymns, Inanna's physical intimacy with the kings seems to have guaranteed the longevity of the kingship.¹¹⁸ Just as Sumerian kings made ideological capital out of a mythical sexual relationship between Inanna and Dumuzi, so in the Hellenized Troad (whether at Scepsis or elsewhere) 'Aineiad' kings appear to have made ideological capital out of a mythical sexual relationship between Aphrodite and Anchises that gave rise to Aineias, their eponymous archegete. Likewise again on Hellenic

¹¹² On Aphrodite's cult at Eryx, and its Greek-Phoenician character, see Lietz 2012, esp. 215.

¹¹³ In general, Phoenicians in this role: López-Ruiz 2010: 2, 23–47, and *passim*; S. P. Morris 1992: 112–13 and *passim*; Rollinger 1996: 159 (focusing on the regions of North Syria and SE Asia Minor, Cyprus, Palestine); 2011: 220; Louden 2006: 12–13; Noegel 2007: 28–9; Woodard 2007: 102–4; Lane Fox 2008: *passim*. Differently, emphasizing the role of Anatolian peoples, and de-emphasizing the Phoenician-Greek link, Bachvarova 2016: *passim*.

¹¹⁴ Smith 1981a: 8–9.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Hardwick 2003: 9–10, on 'translation across cultures'.

¹¹⁶ Faulkner 2008: 3–18; cf. Janko 1982: 158; 1992: 143, 371–2; cf. 1998: 6; J. Griffin 1992: 200 n. 24; M. L. West 2003c: 15 and n. 17; N. J. Richardson 2010: 244–5. The difference in wording between *Haph* 197 and *Il.* 20.308 has been variously explained as rhapsodic variation (Sbardella 2012b: 227–9) and as showing dependence of the former on the latter (Faulkner 2008: 32; Brilllet-Dubois 2011: 127–8; but ἐκγεγόνουται, *Haph* 197, 'need not be post-Homeric', Janko 1982: 157). The gist of the verses is probably the same: that Aineias' descendants are to rule in perpetuity (Janko 1982: 158; differently, Olson 2012: 9).

¹¹⁷ *Haph* 197 and *Il.* 20.308 as aetiological: Scodel 2002: 45–6 (differently, Smith 1981b: 20–1). These passages point to contemporary descendants of Aineias (not necessarily ancestors of the 'Aineiadaí' known to Demetrius of Scepsis in the second century BC, Str. 13.1.52) as surely as Pind. O.6.51 points to contemporary descendants of Iamos. The requirement of Olson 2012: 5, 8–9, 9 n. 19 that we must have secure and independent knowledge of a seventh-century dynasty of 'Aineiadaí' before seeing a reference to them in *Il.* 20.308 and *Haph* 197 is too stringent.

¹¹⁸ *Dumuzi-Inanna D₁* ii.36–70; Brisch 2011: 709–10; 2007: 28, 30; Cooper 1993: 91; Flückiger-Hawker 1999: 42–58; Lapinkivi 2004: 187, 246–8. Taken over into Akkadian: Hymn to Ishtar for the Babylonian King Ammiditana (c.1683–1647 BC): Foster 2005: 85–7; cf. Leick 1994: 180–1; Penglase 1994: 47.

Cyprus, the 'Kinyrad' kings of Paphos appear to have made ideological capital out of a mythical sexual relationship between Aphrodite and Kinyras, their eponymous archegete.¹¹⁹ We might say that the Greeks, in the Troad and on Cyprus, received and naturalized a Near Eastern version of a kingship-legitimizing myth. (Later the Romans would receive and naturalize the Greek version of the same kingship-legitimizing myth, giving their own cultural twist to the kingship ideology underlying the narrative of Aphrodite, Anchises, Aineias, and Aineias' descendants.)¹²⁰ We have here, therefore, not only 'the transfer of a narrative chain' but also 'the transfer of "application", or the message of the myth.'¹²¹ The Greek poet appears to have found in Near Eastern poetry a culturally embedded narrative whose original application he understood well enough to translate sensitively and creatively into his own cultural context.

It may be helpful to put this in the context of other examples of cross-cultural translation in early Greek hexameter poetry.¹²² In the Standard Babylonian *Gilgamesh*, Ishtar, goddess of love, goes up to heaven and is consoled by her parents Anu and Antu (etymologically, Mr and Mrs Sky); in *Iliad* V, Aphrodite, goddess of love, goes up to heaven and is consoled by her parents Zeus and Dione (etymologically, Mr and Mrs Sky; see further § 5.10).¹²³ In the Hurrian-Hittite *Kingship in Heaven (Song of Birth)*,¹²⁴ we find a succession of divine rulers: Alalu, Anu (sky god), Kumarbi (god of the corn harvest), Teshub (storm god); in Hesiod's *Theogony* we also find a succession of divine rulers: Ouranos (sky god), Kronos (a harvest god), Zeus (storm god).¹²⁵ Again in the Hittite *Kingship in Heaven (Song of Birth)*, the basalt which Kumarbi apparently attempts to ingest in lieu of the storm god Teshub is thrown to a specified place, receives a name, and becomes a focus of sacrifice (Hoffner 1998: 44 no. 14 § 15); in Hesiod's *Theogony*, the stone which Kronos ingests in lieu of Zeus and vomits up is then placed in Delphi 'to be a

¹¹⁹ J. Karageorghis and V. Karageorghis 2002: 277; cf. Burkert 1979a: 197 n. 7. Kinyras and Kinyradai: Currie 2005: 275–6.

¹²⁰ Virg. *Aen.* 3.97–8; cf. Lyc. *Alex.* 1226–80; Q.S. 13.336–41 (Hadjittofi 2007: 362–5). On Virgil's appropriation of *Il.* 20.307–8 at *Aen.* 3.97–8, see Barchiesi 2001 (1995): 134. (Virgil perhaps read the variant πάντεσσιν for Τρώεσσιν: Smith 1981b: 44 n. 49; M. L. West 1998–2000: ii.231, note on 307.)

¹²¹ Cf. Burkert 1987: 12 = 2003: 50; cf. 1992: 88.

¹²² Haubold 2013a: 31 is less sanguine about 'sustainable models of cross-cultural reading'.

¹²³ A feminine theonym 'Dione' was probably just exploited, rather than invented, for this episode: Pulleyn 2006: 59–61; cf. Dunkel 1988–91; Burkert 2004: 43; M. L. West 2007: 139–40. At Philo of Byblos *FGrH* 790 F2 (after 'Sanchuniathon'), 'Dione' calques Ba'alat, a feminine formation from Ba'al, who equates to Zeus (Cassio 2012: 420 with n. 49).

¹²⁴ *Kingship in Heaven* is the conventional English title, *Song of Birth* renders the original Hittite title (Corti 2007; Bachvarova 2016: 25 n. 16).

¹²⁵ Kumarbi and Kronos as harvest gods: Haas 1994: 167–71, esp. 171; Woodard 2007: 153 n. 35; Lane Fox 2008: 280. Teshub and Zeus as storm gods: Woodard 2007: 95–6.

sign hereafter, an object of awe for mortal men' (*Th.* 485–7, 497–500).¹²⁶ All these instances of cross-cultural translation presuppose an understanding of how a foreign literature is used, linguistically and culturally, in its own context and an interest in seeing how it can be fitted linguistically, mythologically, politically into contemporary Greek contexts.¹²⁷ The process of translation is active and creative, not passive or mechanical.¹²⁸ 'Contemporary contexts', moreover, here must mean the late eighth or the seventh century BC.¹²⁹ We are not likely to be dealing with a Bronze Age reception either with the aetiological reference to the descendants of Aineias ruling in the Troad (*HApH* 196–7 and *Il.* 20.307–8) or the aetiological reference to the Delphic stone in Hesiod's Succession Myth (*Th.* 499–500) or with these aspects of Aphrodite's mythology. These particular cultural 'translations' rely on details that can hardly be retrojected beyond the eighth–seventh-century Greek world.¹³⁰

To our earlier claim (§§ 5.5–5.6) that *Iliad* XIV receives motifs from a pre-Homeric **Hymn to Aphrodite* we may now add the claim that *HApH* receives motifs from Near Eastern poetry. This would be a chain of reception of astonishing chronological depth, about which the next section will attempt to say more.

¹²⁶ M. L. West 1997: 279–80; Haas 2006: 139–40; Woodard 2007: 95; Lane Fox 2008: 296–7; I. C. Rutherford 2009: 11. Bernabé 2004b: 305: 'although we find in Hesiod's *Theogony* undeniable traces of the influence of the Hittite poem *Kingship in Heaven*, it is not less true that the poet (or the tradition he depends on, or both) does not assume them in a mechanical way, but he adapts them in order to make them compatible with the typically Greek religious ways of thinking.'

¹²⁷ Compare the remarks of Haider 2005: 330, on the adaptation of Near Eastern material in the Zeus–Typhon myth: 'Der Transfer dieser geistigen, speziell religiösen Inhalte kann im konkreten Fall nur dort möglich gewesen sein, wo Vertreter der griechischen Kultur in engstem und bezogen auf Einzelpersonen in längerfristigem Kontakt mit der syrisch-luwisch-aramäischen wie phönizischen Bevölkerung zusammenlebten. Zudem muss vonseiten der Empfänger ein Interesse an der Übernahme dieser geistigen Inhalte bestanden haben, was wiederum nur geweckt werden konnte, wenn eben ein enges Zusammenleben gegeben war. Ein solches Interesse an einer Adaptierung fremder religiöser Vorstellungen und Mythen war dann umso größer, wenn man durch dieselbe die eigene Welt- und Wertvorstellung aufwerten bzw. zumindest bereichern zu können glaubte.'

¹²⁸ Penglass 1994: 239.

¹²⁹ Cf. Caduff 1986: 131; Rollinger 2011: 220–1, 224.

¹³⁰ Delphi was an important sanctuary in Greece from c.750 BC: M. L. West 1966: 41 (contrast *ibid.* 29; but cf. 1988: 170–1 = 2011b: 69–71); 2011a: 18–19; J. Griffin 1995: 124. Although some aspects of Aphrodite's mythology may hark back to an Indo-European Dawn goddess (Boedeker 1974: 1–17; M. L. West 2007: 186, 221), eighth–seventh-century hexameter poetry had no canonical version of her parentage: she is a daughter of Zeus and Dione in the *Iliad* and born of Ouranos' genitals in Hesiod's *Theogony*, each version showing strong Near Eastern influence (*Gilg.* SBV VI and the *Kingship in Heaven* [*Song of Birth*] respectively). Her name is not found in Mycenaean and may be a post-Bronze Age Greek rendering of Semitic Ashtoret (cf. Beekes 2010: i.179; differently, M. L. West 2000b).

5.9 *Gilgamesh* and the Dumuzi–Inanna Songs

Another link in that chain appears to be constituted by the Standard Babylonian version of the Mesopotamian epic of *Gilgamesh*, traditionally held to be the achievement of the scribe Sîn-lēqi-unninni sometime between the thirteenth and eleventh centuries BC.¹³¹ In Tablet VI, Gilgamesh, after killing the guardian of the cedar forest, Humbaba, washes and dresses and proceeds to excite the attention of Ishtar, who proposes that they become man and wife. Gilgamesh reviles the goddess with a list of her former lovers, and an incensed Ishtar ascends to heaven and complains before her father Anu (*Gilg.* SBV VI.1–114). Forerunners of this scene in the Standard Babylonian epic are found in Middle Babylonian versions of *Gilgamesh* of the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BC and in the Sumerian *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*, attested in the twenty-first century BC.¹³²

This scene with Gilgamesh and Ishtar in the Akkadian epic seems to play off the Sumerian corpus of Dumuzi–Inanna songs, or perhaps we should say, seems to play off the Dumuzi–Inanna songs through the window of the Sumerian Royal Hymns.¹³³ In the Standard Babylonian epic, Gilgamesh, as Ishtar's intended, is cast in the role of Dumuzi.¹³⁴ Or rather, we should perhaps say, he is cast in the role of the Sumerian kings in the Royal Hymns who in the 'sacred marriage' play the role of Dumuzi (being called, as we have seen, 'the shepherd', 'Dumuzi', or 'Ama-ushumgal-ana'). Gilgamesh, however, plays out this role with mischievous subversion.¹³⁵ (In fact, a subversive 'intertextual' dialogue between Gilgamesh/Bilgames poetry and the Royal Hymns appears to go back *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*, a composition of the Ur III period and thus contemporary with the Royal Hymns, in which Inanna makes overtures to Bilgames as 'Ninegal' or 'divine Palace Lady', the title she bears in the 'sacred marriage' texts.)¹³⁶ We may note the following four striking inversions of situation. First, in *Gilgamesh* the bathing-and-dressing motif is attached not to the love goddess Ishtar, but to the hero-king,

¹³¹ George 1999: pp. xxiv–xxv; cf. M. L. West 1997: 65; Beckman 2003: 40. On Tablet XII, see George 2003: i.47–54.

¹³² *Gilg.* MB Bog₂ rev. col. vi(?) (c.xiii BC; see George 2003: i.317–25); *Gilg.* MB Emar₂ (George 2003: i.331–8; c.xii BC: *ibid.* i.26, 327). Sumerian *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*: translation: George 1999: 166–75, esp. 170–1; *ETCSL* 1.8.1.2. See George 2003: i.11–12 (synopsis); cf. 1999: xix–xx; cf. xvii.

¹³³ Petriconi 1964: 331; Tigay 1982: 175.

¹³⁴ Halperin 1983: 190.

¹³⁵ Walls 2001: 22, 35: 'The epic of Gilgamesh plays on this type-scene [*sic*] by switching the roles of male and female, with the bathing king attracting the amorous attention of the goddess Ishtar.'

¹³⁶ George 1999: 167. Cf., e.g., *Iddindagan A* 164 = *ETCSL* t.2.5.3.1; *Shulgi X* 74; Sefati 1998: 81 and n. 120; Walls 2001: 42–3. On the relationship of *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven* and the 'sacred marriage' texts, see Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi 1993: 100; George 1999: 168.

Gilgamesh (*Gilg.* SBV VI.1–5).¹³⁷ Second, the marriage proposal and invitation to sexual intercourse come not from Gilgamesh, as they do from Dumuzi, but from Ishtar herself. Third, the love goddess' proposition is rejected by Gilgamesh, so that no sexual intercourse results. Fourth, Gilgamesh vituperates Ishtar as a pernicious goddess and subjects her to a litany of her misdeeds, whereas in the Royal Hymns Inanna is exalted and viewed as a bringer of blessings to king and land.¹³⁸

These evocations and reversals of general situation are complemented by striking evocations and reversals of details. First, Ishtar employs a pathetic fallacy to indicate the enthusiastic reception Gilgamesh will receive from her house (*Gilg.* SBV VI.14–15: 'As you enter our house, / doorway and footstool shall kiss your feet!'). A closely comparable phrase occurs in a Middle Babylonian composition in which Ishtar looks forward to Dumuzi's visit: 'When you come in, may the doorbolt welcome you. (Let the door fly open, all by itself!).'¹³⁹ Second, the motif of the house scented with cedar (*Gilg.* SBV VI.13: 'Enter our house amid the sweet scent of cedar!') is found also in a Royal Hymn: 'Holy Inanna rubs herself with soap; / she sprinkles oil and cedar essence on the ground' (*Iddindagan A* 183–4).¹⁴⁰ (We may note, however, that the motif also occurs more widely in marriage contexts.)¹⁴¹ Third, the proposition made by Ishtar to Gilgamesh (*Gilg.* SBV VI.9: 'Be you my husband and I your wife!')¹⁴² inverts the normal form of the marriage proposition, made by the man to his prospective bride. A marriage proposition in an Akkadian incantation of the first millennium BC takes the form: 'You be my wife, I will be

¹³⁷ Fritz 2003: 311, text to n. 1265. The bathing-and-dressing motif is attached to the king in the Royal Hymn *Shulgi X* 9–73, esp. 9–13 '[Shulgi] dressed himself in the *ba* garment and put a *hili* wig on his head as a crown. Inanna looked at him with admiration and spontaneously struck up a song, singing the words' (following Klein 1981: 126 n. 205, with Leick 1994: 98 and 287 n. 1; Sefati 1998: 39 and n. 21). This may be compared with *Gilg.* SBV VI.5–6: 'Then did Gilgamesh put on his crown. / On the beauty of Gilgamesh Lady Ishtar looked with longing'; Sefati 1998: 113 n. 187. However, in *Shulgi X* motifs of bathing and adornment are attached both to Shulgi and to Inanna, in *Gilg.* SBV VI they are attached exclusively to Gilgamesh.

¹³⁸ Inanna's promised blessings in the Dumuzi–Inanna songs and the Royal Hymns: *Dumuzi-Inanna P* i.22–6 = Sefati 1998: 223–4; *Shulgi X* 35–41, 49–73 = Klein 1981: 139–41; *Iddindagan A* 210–28 = Reisman 1969: 177; Black et al. 2004: 267–8). Sefati 1998: 48–9, 108; Lapinkivi 2004: 247.

¹³⁹ Foster 2005: 167: *Come in, Shepherd!* (*Erbamma re'û*), lines 6–7. Cf. George 2003: i.471 and n. 97. Dumuzi entering Inanna's house: Sefati 1998: 102–3.

¹⁴⁰ Trans. Black et al. 2004: 267.

¹⁴¹ See George 2003: i.470 and n. 96; cf. Sefati 1998: 100–1. Cf. Cat. 68.144; Ps.-Virg. *Ciris* 512; Lyne 1978: 310.

¹⁴² There is a possible precursor of this line already in the Sumerian *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven* (George 1999: 170) and in the Middle Babylonian *Gilgamesh*: *Gilg.* MB Boğ₂ rev. col. vi (?).5': 'Let me be your <wife and you> be my <husband ... >.' The identical line to *Gilg.* SBV VI.9 also occurs in the Middle Babylonian version of *Nergal and Ereshkigal*, line 83 (Foster 2005: 512, no. III.20.(a)) (*Ereshkigal* to *Nergal*).

your husband.¹⁴³ Fourth, Ishtar promises gifts to Gilgamesh (*Gilg.* SBV VI.10–12, 17–21); such gifts were normally offered by the groom to the bride, including by Dumuzi to Inanna in the Dumuzi–Inanna songs.¹⁴⁴ Some of these instances may be ‘topoi’, and by no means uniquely attached to either the Dumuzi–Inanna songs or the Royal Hymns; still, the case for allusion remains.¹⁴⁵ These various evocations and inversions, both general and specific, strongly suggest that *Gilg.* SBV VI is in dialogue with the Dumuzi–Inanna tradition, cross-fertilized with the Royal Hymns.

Of particular interest, however, is the mythological catalogue which caps Gilgamesh’s repudiation of Ishtar and in which Gilgamesh recites to Ishtar her former lovers and recounts their fates (*Gilg.* SBV VI.44–79). The catalogue is rich in allusion.¹⁴⁶ The first and last lovers in the list particularly call out for attention. The first-named lover is Dumuzi (*Gilg.* SBV VI.46–7).¹⁴⁷ If we grant a dialogue between *Gilgamesh* and the Dumuzi–Inanna tradition, Dumuzi’s name is bound to be seen as a → signal of the literary model: metapoetically, Gilgamesh indicates his poetic precursor. We would have a technique of signalling here comparable to the way the *Dios apate* signals Aphrodite as Hera’s model.

The last of Ishtar’s lovers in Gilgamesh’s catalogue is Ishullanu (*Gilg.* SBV VI.64–78). He is to be identified with Shukaletuda, male protagonist of the Sumerian narrative poem *Inanna and Shukaletuda*.¹⁴⁸ In that poem, Shukaletuda is punished by Inanna for raping her while she slept in the vegetable garden which he was tending. The summary mythological narrative given by Gilgamesh in *Gilg.* SBV retains the core details of a one-sided sexual interest and ensuing divine punishment, but contains a striking reversal: in Gilgamesh’s catalogue, Ishullanu is punished by Ishtar for *refusing* her after *she* has propositioned him.¹⁴⁹ The inversion turns the Shukaletuda–Ishullanu myth into an exemplum suitable to its narrative context in *Gilg.* SBV VI, where Ishtar propositions Gilgamesh and he refuses her.¹⁵⁰ We therefore have here

¹⁴³ Foster 2005: 987 no. IV.(a).8–9. Cf. George 2003: i.470 ‘[Ishtar’s] words are an inversion of the conventional *verba solemnna* of a marriage proposal’, *ibid.* ii.829. Greengus 1969: 516–17 gives a divorce formula: ‘you are not my wife, you are not my husband’.

¹⁴⁴ George 2003: i.470, ii.829; cf. Fritz 2003: 310–11. Sumerian wedding rites: Leick 1994: 66. Gifts offered to Inanna by Dumuzi: e.g. *Dumuzi-Inanna T* 5–24 (= Sefati 1998: 249–50); *Dumuzi-Inanna C* 32–48. Gifts required of Dumuzi by Inanna: Sefati 1998: 103, 109–11 (esp. *The Shepherd and the Farmer*, Sefati 1998: 331–4); Lapinkivi 2004: 64–5.

¹⁴⁵ → Allusion via typical elements.

¹⁴⁶ Volk 1995: 61 and n. 409; cf. 62 and n. 421.

¹⁴⁷ Dumuzi is likewise the first in the catalogue of Ishtar’s lovers in the Middle Babylonian version (*Gilg.* MB Emar₂ i.22’–23’).

¹⁴⁸ Ishullanu = Shukaletuda: Volk 1995: 58–60; George 2003: ii.835, 838–9. English translation of *Inanna and Shukaletuda*: Black et al. 2004: 197–205; *ETCSL* 1.3.3. Discussion: Lapinkivi 2004: 220–6.

¹⁴⁹ Volk 1995: 58.

¹⁵⁰ Volk 1995: 61–2. Cf. Abusch 1986: 167–71; Lapinkivi 2004: 223–4.

bold ad hoc invention in *Gilgamesh* of a kind like that investigated for Homer by J. T. Kakridis and M. W. Willcock, a well-known example being Achilles' invention of the detail of Niobe breaking her fast in his narration of the mythological exemplum at *Iliad* 24.601–20.¹⁵¹ The embedded story of Ishtar and Ishullanu shows us, with its detailed evocation and inversion of its model, *Inanna and Shukaletuda*, how to 'read' the primary narrative of Ishtar and Gilgamesh, which for its part evokes and inverts its model, the Dumuzi–Inanna songs, conflated with the Royal Hymns.¹⁵² The Ishtar–Ishullanu embedded story therefore functions as a $\rightarrow$ *mise en abyme* much as we find it in Homer: 'a text-within-text that functions as a microcosm or mirror of the text itself' (compare, for instance, the Meleagros paradigm in *Iliad* IX).¹⁵³

There is a decidedly 'textual', fine-grained quality to the interaction of *Gilgamesh* with its poetic models, featuring verbatim quotation from the source, reversal of the source, signalling of the source, the use of character-text as a vehicle for traditional mythological material, and ad hoc mythological invention: incidentally, precisely the features that we have seen in early Greek hexameter poetic interactions, including between *Haph* and the Iliadic *Dios apate*.

Let us pause to make three observations. First, it was argued earlier (§ 5.8) that the *Hymn to Aphrodite* draws (at whatever remove) on Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna poetry. That may now be seen in a wider context: other Near Eastern poetry (*Gilg.* SBV; Sumerian *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*) also draws on Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna poetry. Second, certain of the techniques of poetic interaction that we may observe between some early Greek hexameter poems (e.g. *Iliad* XIV and *Hymn to Aphrodite*) can also be observed between poems in a Sumerian–Akkadian poetic tradition (*Gilg.* SBV and Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna poetry). For the time being, we content ourselves with observing that certain techniques of allusion in the early Greek hexameter tradition *parallel* techniques of allusion in a much older Sumerian–Akkadian poetic tradition; the question whether the Sumerian–Akkadian techniques of

¹⁵¹ J. T. Kakridis 1949: 41, 98–9, 102–3; Willcock 2001 (1964); cf. Willcock 1977: esp. 43–4; D. L. Cairns 2001: 48–9. Ad hoc invention in Homer: Lohmann 1970: 196–202; Braswell 1971; M. W. Edwards 1987a: 67–8; Janko 1992: 164, 179; Scodel 2002: 24–7, 136–42. Differently, Nagy 1996a: 113–46. Affinity between ad hoc invention in mythological paradigmata and motif transference: Burgess 2006a: 176; 2009: 67–8. Ritoók 1994/1995: 47–8 maintains that mythological exemplum in an 'ABA' structure' is found in Homer but not in early Mesopotamian epic; the claim seems invalidated by *Gilg.* SBV VI.24–43 (= A), 44–78 (= B), 79 (= A').

¹⁵² The Ishullanu paradigm within *Gilg* SBV: George 2003: i.473. Scodel 2002: 26 argues with regard to innovation in paradigmatic narratives in Homer that neither the characters nor the external audience 'should care about inconsistency or the literal truth (i.e., fidelity to earlier versions / objective traditionality)'. This would not be the case here, where it is likely that 'through the distortion of (literary-)historical facts' *Gilgamesh* meant to hurt Ishtar 'in a way that, predictably, was bound to provoke her to the utmost' (Volk 1995: 62, translated).

¹⁵³ Quotation: Martin 2000: 63. Meleagros paradigm: Willcock 2001 (1964): 449.

allusion may have *influenced* those of the Greek hexameter tradition is reserved for later (§ 5.19). And third, the interactions observed here are of an irreducibly textualized kind: this is not just → mythological intertextuality.

5.10 *Gilgamesh* and Early Greek Hexameter Poetry I: *Iliad* V

In both the *Hymn to Aphrodite* (202–40) and the *Dios apate* (*Il.* 14.315–27) we find a mythological catalogue of previous love affairs.¹⁵⁴ There is no precedent for such a mythological catalogue in the Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna songs or the Royal Hymns. The precedent is rather to be found in *Gilgamesh*’s catalogue of Ishtar’s former lovers at *Gilg.* SBV VI.45–79. W. Burkert and others have accordingly claimed the *Gilgamesh* passage as a model for these early Greek hexameter passages.¹⁵⁵ To help assess the plausibility of that claim we should first consider another Iliadic scene for which *Gilg.* SBV VI appears more certainly to be the model, at whatever remove: ⇒ *Iliad* 5.334–430.

The similarities between the scene of Diomedes wounding Aphrodite at *Iliad* 5.334–430 and the scene of *Gilgamesh* repudiating Ishtar in *Gilg.* SBV VI.22–91 are well known and have already been touched on (§ 5.8).¹⁵⁶ Here it will suffice to recall briefly four points of similarity. First, Aphrodite suffers humiliation in the form of physical wounding at Diomedes’ hands and departs to heaven in distress (*Il.* 5.343, 352, 354, 361); Ishtar suffered humiliation in the form of a verbal drubbing at *Gilgamesh*’s hands and departed to heaven in a fury (*Gilg.* SBV VI.81–3).¹⁵⁷ Second, Diomedes taunts Aphrodite at her departure (*Il.* 5.347–51); Enkidu similarly taunted Ishtar at a later stage of the Bull of Heaven episode (*Gilg.* SBV VI.154–7).¹⁵⁸ Third, Aphrodite in heaven seeks out her parents Zeus and Dione (*Il.* 5.370, 381), as Ishtar in heaven sought out her parents Anu and Antu (*Gilg.* SBV VI.82–3). Fourth, Dione comforts Aphrodite with a mythological catalogue containing examples of deities who suffered at the hands of mortals (*Il.* 5.383–404).¹⁵⁹ Similarly, and also differently, *Gilgamesh* justified refusing Ishtar by reeling off a mythological catalogue containing examples of Ishtar’s former lovers who suffered at her hands (*Gilg.* SBV VI.45–79).¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁴ Sammons 2010: 63–73 on Zeus’ catalogue in the *Dios apate*.

¹⁵⁵ Burkert 1992: 93, 202 n. 18; M. L. West 1997: 411–12. Cf. Janko 1992: 202; Hunter 1999: 96.

¹⁵⁶ Burkert 1992: 96–9; Penglase 1994: 4; Andersen 1997; M. L. West 1997: 361–2; Bachvarova 2016: 325–6.

¹⁵⁷ In the Sumerian *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*, Bilgames also rejects Inanna and makes her weep: George 2003: i.11.

¹⁵⁸ Bilgames himself taunts Inanna in the equivalent scene in the Sumerian *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven* (George 1999: 174).

¹⁵⁹ Dione’s catalogue is discussed by Sammons 2010: 24–38.

¹⁶⁰ Andersen 1997: 30 n. 15.

The correspondences seem specific and extensive enough to rule out parallel development in independent but similar poetic traditions. This is not the reception of an isolated motif, but of several motifs structured in a particular narrative sequence. It is likely that the *Iliad* is engaged here in a reception of *Gilgamesh* in something very like the Standard Babylonian version. There are, of course, differences between the scenes.¹⁶¹ For instance, Ishtar comes down to ask Gilgamesh to be her lover, whereas Aphrodite comes down to save Aineias' life; Gilgamesh 'wounds' Ishtar with words; Diomedes wounds Aphrodite with the spear; and so on. Still, the similarities are not negated by these differences.¹⁶²

There can in general be no hard and fast rules as to when similarities or parallels should be taken to argue a literary dependence between two works or when the differences between the works should be taken to exclude it.¹⁶³ It is inapposite to deny literary dependence between two works simply by pointing to differences between them—as if one could ever expect near-total convergence between source- and target-texts (not even uncontroversial cases of literary dependence, say Virgil's on Homer or Milton's on Virgil, show that).¹⁶⁴ Differences, even pronounced ones, do not argue against dependence, in the presence of sufficiently compelling similarities.¹⁶⁵ It is the similarities, not the differences, that are probative, provided that they are → marked and meaningful.¹⁶⁶ The similarities between the Diomedes–Aphrodite scene of *Iliad* V and the Gilgamesh–Ishtar scene of *Gilg.* SBV VI are unusually strongly marked. They are also, as I will presently suggest, meaningful.

A salient difference between the *Gilg.* SBV VI scene and the *Iliad* V scene is that the Iliadic scene seems to be divorced from a seduction narrative: in Homer, Aphrodite comes among men to rescue her son on the battlefield, not, as in the Akkadian text, to proposition a hero. Yet on closer inspection the

¹⁶¹ On the differences, cf. Burkert 1992: 99; Andersen 1997: 30.

¹⁶² In general: Burkert 1987: 19 = 2003: 58; Burgess 2009: 81. → Similarities versus differences.

¹⁶³ Metcalf 2015: 191: 'When comparing an episode from a text like the *Iliad* to a Near Eastern source, many scholars would tend to focus on the (invariably "striking") similarities, whereupon their critics would object that (invariably "significant") differences also exist.' Cf. Burkert 1979a: 20; Crane 1988: 62–3; Tigay 1993; Bernabé 1995: 17–18; Brown 1995–2001: iii. p.VII; Rollinger 1996: 157–8; 2011: 218; Henkelman 2006: 815–16.

¹⁶⁴ → Refiguration. Cf. Hor. *AP* 133–5, with Brink 1971: 211: 'The third fault is straightforward imitation... Use of a *traditional* theme must be *original*. While in one sense of the word no literature is more imitative than Augustan poetry, in another none is more creative than Virgil's or H[orace]'s work.'

¹⁶⁵ M. L. West 1997: viii: 'You cannot argue against the fact that it is raining by pointing out that much of the sky is blue.'

¹⁶⁶ Contrast Margalit 1989: 483: 'It can in fact be argued that not only are *Aqht* and *Gilgamesh* not, as some contend, mere variations on a common theme, but that, to the contrary, they are so different as to be virtually antithetical'; Kelly 2008: 289: 'Burkert suggests that Zeus' catalogue of his lovers (*Il.* 14.315–28) "has its counterpart in Gilgamesh's enumeration of the lovers of Ishtar". Yet the contexts and purposes of these two catalogues are entirely different.'

Iliadic scene is in fact found to be doubly attached to seduction. First, the scene is linked via Aineias to a seduction narrative that lies outside the action of the *Iliad*: that of Aphrodite and Anchises. We are reminded that Aineias is the issue of that encounter between love goddess and cow-herding hero at *Iliad* 5.313. Second, the wounding of Aphrodite by Diomedes in *Iliad* V is linked with another seduction which does lie within the action of the poem: Paris' seduction of Helene in book III. That intratextual link is carefully signalled by Athene's mischievous question whether Aphrodite pricked her hand on a hairpin while caressing one of those Achaean women whom she was persuading to follow the Trojans (*Il.* 5.422–5): Athene's generalizing plurals ('some one of the Achaean women', 422, 424; 'Trojans', 423) are a thinly veiled dig at Aphrodite's involvement in, specifically, Helene's elopement with Paris. This, in other words, is a back-reference to *Iliad* 3.382–447 (a scene to which we may therefore take the gods to have been privy, like the external audience).¹⁶⁷ That scene between Paris and Helene in *Iliad* III is linked in turn, this time intertextually, with a seduction scene of the (Proto-)Cypria: the elopement of Helene with Paris from Sparta (evoked at *Il.* 3.387, 443).¹⁶⁸ Thus Aphrodite's wounding in *Iliad* V is strongly, if complexly, linked with seduction scenes: her own of Anchises, and Paris' seduction, with her connivance, of Helene. Athene's gloating over Aphrodite in *Iliad* V (422–5) is, moreover, linked intertextually with Aphrodite's (pseudo-)seduction of Paris: as K. Reinhardt pointed out, the mocking presence of precisely Athene and Hera beside Aphrodite (*Il.* 5.418–19) recalls the same constellation of goddesses at the Judgement of Paris.¹⁶⁹ In this way the wounding of Aphrodite in *Iliad* V seems to be presented as a continuation of (and retribution for) Aphrodite's role in seduction scenes, narrated both inside the poem (Paris and Helene in Troy, *Iliad* III) and outside it (Aphrodite and Anchises on Mt Ida, Aphrodite and Paris on Mt Ida, Paris and Helene in Sparta). We may say that the Iliadic scene lacks the explicit connection with the seduction sequence that we find in *Gilgamesh*, but that the *Iliad* still appears to know and to exploit the scene's associations with seduction sequences.¹⁷⁰ So the *Iliad* appears to show an awareness of the original narrative context of the motif of the love goddess's humiliation, while adapting that motif to a new narrative situation; the motif of the love goddess's humiliation as employed in *Iliad* V has not just become a

¹⁶⁷ Reinhardt 1960 (1938): 27 = 1997: 181–2; Erbse 1986: 92. Aristot. *Poet.* 1454b5–6 *ἅπαντα γὰρ ἀποδίδομεν τοῖς θεοῖς ὄραν*.

¹⁶⁸ Kullmann 1960: 250–1; Schein 1984: 21; Erbse 1986: 97; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 105–6.

¹⁶⁹ Reinhardt 1960 (1938): 27–8 = 1997: 181–2; Andersen 1997: 35. Cf. A.R. 3.53–4, with Hunter 1989: 103–4.

¹⁷⁰ Cassio 2012: 421–3, following Σ bT *Il.* 5.385b, sees a deliberate suppression of the myth of Aphrodite's love for Adonis in Dione's first mythological paradigm, the chaining of Ares by Otos and Ephialtes (*Il.* 5.381–91). Cf. Teffeteller 2010: 140–1.

'floating motif'.¹⁷¹ This is one way in which perception of the similarities between *Iliad* V and *Gilg.* SBV V may be said to be meaningful.¹⁷² It may not have been apparent at first how it enhances our understanding of the *Iliad* V scene to be reminded of a scene in Babylonian poetry where the love goddess tried her hand at seducing a hero and was cut down to size. But these are precisely the themes also of the *Iliad* V passage, viz. Aphrodite's backstory (like Ishtar's) as an arch-seductress; and the curtailment in the narrative of her success by the spirited resistance of a hero (Diomedes, like Gilgamesh).

More should briefly be said about this Iliadic reception of Ishtar. In *Iliad* V Aphrodite is emphatically not a goddess of war (331–3, 348–51, 428–30), and that could be seen as a pointed contrast with Mesopotamian Ishtar–Inanna.¹⁷³ In Greece Aphrodite seems not, on the whole, to have been a martial goddess.¹⁷⁴ It would seem, therefore, that the *Iliad*'s reception of a motif from *Gilg.* SBV has been shaped by differences between the two cultures. But the warlike characteristics of Ishtar are not just excluded from the Iliadic presentation of Aphrodite; rather, they are, arguably, pointedly transferred to two deities in *Iliad* V who are, in their different ways, complementary opposites to Aphrodite: Athene and Ares (cf. *Il.* 5.430). The manner in which Athene assists Diomedes in battle in *Iliad* V (1–8, 114–32, 793–859; similarly with Achilles at 20.94–6, an *aristeia* mirroring Diomedes' in book V) has been compared to the way in which Ishtar is said in royal inscriptions to assist the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal (669–627 BC).¹⁷⁵ Thus the military aspects of Ishtar that are unsuited to the Greek Aphrodite are displaced onto Athene and onto the specialist male Greek god of war, Ares, who in being wounded by Diomedes

¹⁷¹ Floating motifs: Irvin 1978; Burkert 1987: 12, 18 = 2003: 50, 57.

¹⁷² The Iliadic allusion to *Gilg.* SBV VI may be found meaningful in other ways as well. Just as Gilgamesh's confrontation with Ishtar crowns his greatest exploit, the killing of Humbaba, so Diomedes' confrontation with Aphrodite in his *aristeia* indicates the acme of his heroism. The implied intertextual equation of Diomedes and Gilgamesh seems strange; but Achilles in the *Iliad* generally evokes Gilgamesh (see § 5.19 pp. 216–17), and Diomedes in *Iliad* V is an allusive doublet of Achilles (see Appendix C); hence the → double transference Gilgamesh > Achilles > Diomedes makes sense. The manipulation of the mythological catalogue (*Il.* 5.383–404) is considered at § 5.13.

¹⁷³ Andersen 1997: 35; cf. Erbse 1986: 93; Breitenberger 2007: 24–5. For Inanna in this role, cf. e.g. *A tigi to Inanna* (Inanna E) (*ETCSL* 4.07.5); *Self-praise of Ishtar* = Foster 2005: 679 no. III.43. (f); Leick 1994: 64. The warlike character of Ishtar: Haas 1999: 30–1.

¹⁷⁴ Budin 2010; cf. Pirenne-Delforge 1994: 450–4. Differently, Pironti 2007: 209–77; 2010: 121–5. Pausanias mentions cult statues of Aphrodite 'in arms', and a temple of 'Aphrodite Areia' in Sparta (2.5.1, 3.15.10, 3.17.5, references I owe to Prof. M. J. Clarke).

¹⁷⁵ Rollinger 1996: 173–4, 177, 188, 194–7; cf. 2011: 224–6. Ishtar of Arbela declared in a dream to Ashurbanipal's troops: 'I will go in front of Ashurbanipal' (Streck 1916: 48–9; Borger 1996: 50 A v.100). Ishtar of Arbela appeared in a dream to a seer in which she strode armed before Ashurbanipal in battle and spoke with Ashurbanipal like his mother (Streck 1916: 112–19; Borger 1996: 100–1 B v.52–76/C vi.53–78). The royal inscriptions were not solely confined to palace archives: Patzek 2011: 394.

(855–63) appears as a narrative counterpart of Aphrodite.¹⁷⁶ Thus it is tempting to say that the *Iliad*'s reception of a scene, or narrative sequence, from *Gilg. SBV* is sensitive to the cultural freight carried by the scene, in both cultures.

That conclusion would need qualifying, however. The presentation of the goddess of love as an unwarlike deity in a pointed response to a conception of her as a warlike deity is not a peculiarity of the Greek response to Mesopotamia, but is found within Mesopotamian literature itself: Inanna is presented as an unwarlike goddess in a scene of the Sumerian *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*, evidently in a pointed response to the warlike Inanna of the Sumerian Royal Hymns.¹⁷⁷ Similarly, in a closely related scene in the Ugaritic poem *Aqhat*, the hero Aqhat, confronting the goddess Anat, casts her unwarlike character in her teeth (KTU 1.17.vi.39–41).¹⁷⁸ It thus appears that the *Iliad* may have taken even its polemical insistence on the goddess' unwarlikeness from Near Eastern tradition: we might consider, with an only apparent paradox, that the *Iliad* expresses its consciousness of its cultural difference from the Near East via a Near Eastern motif.¹⁷⁹ Such a scenario again assumes quite detailed knowledge of a Near Eastern culture, and careful reflection on how to 'translate' that culture into a Greek context.

Finally, it is important to note the function of the Diomedes–Aphrodite scene in *Iliad* V within the wider context of the *Iliad*. The discomfiture of Aphrodite and Ares in book V figures as a kind of implicit 'retribution' for their roles in the outbreak of the war (*Il.* 3.389–447, 4.439–45). This poetic justice visited on the culpable gods, who are merely wounded by Diomedes in book V, compares and contrasts with that visited on the human culprit, Pandaros, for his violation of the truce in book IV: he gets killed by Diomedes in the very same book.¹⁸⁰ W. Burkert, comparing the Diomedes–Aphrodite scene in *Iliad* V with the Gilgamesh–Ishtar scene of *Gilg. SBV* VI, called the Diomedes–Aphrodite scene in the *Iliad* 'without function'.¹⁸¹ This is untrue if taken to mean that the scene is not at all integrated in the narrative or the themes of the poem.¹⁸² Yet the comment still has its justification. Gilgamesh's repudiation of Ishtar leads to her complaining to Anu, which leads to the unleashing of the Bull of Heaven, which leads to Gilgamesh and Enkidu killing

¹⁷⁶ Differently, Pironti 2007: 218–25.

¹⁷⁷ *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven* A.i.9–10 (Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi 1993: 113, 123; George 1999: 170), humorously reversing the Royal Hymns/'sacred marriage' (George 1999: 168; Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi 1993: 100).

¹⁷⁸ Translation: S. B. Parker 1997: 62: 'And another thing I will say: / bows are [weapons (of)?] warriors. / Will womankind now be hunting?' Similarly of Artemis at *Il.* 21.481–8. Anat as war goddess: Louden 2006: 246.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Currie 2006: 370 for a similar argument with Tasso and Homer.

¹⁸⁰ Taplin 1992: 103–9; Schein 1997: 353–4.

¹⁸¹ Burkert 2004: 44; cf. 1992: 99; 2005: 300. Criticized: Haubold 2013a: 31.

¹⁸² Andersen 1997: 36 argues, rightly, that there is no → 'loss of function' in Homer's scene.

the Bull of Heaven, which leads to the gods dooming Enkidu, which leads to Gilgamesh's quest to Utnapishtim for immortality (and so on). In other words, Gilgamesh's 'wounding' of Ishtar and her plaint in heaven are integral parts of the plot of *Gilgamesh*. The same cannot be said for Diomedes' wounding of Aphrodite and her plaint in heaven in the *Iliad*. We appear to have here, therefore, an excellent example of the *Iliad*'s transformation of 'story' into 'situation', of narrative 'fact' into 'episode'.¹⁸³ The *Iliad* seems to have transformed a motif of *Gilgamesh* in the same kind of way that neoanalysts argue that it transforms motifs from pre-Homeric tradition preserved in the Epic Cycle.¹⁸⁴

5.11 *Gilgamesh* and Early Greek Hexameter Poetry II: *Haph* and *Iliad* XIV

We have seen good reason to see the Diomedes–Aphrodite–Dione–Zeus episode of *Iliad* V (including its mythological catalogue, 385–404) as depending on *Gilg.* SBV VI. We may now return to the question whether the mythological catalogues at *Haph* 202–40 and *Il.* 14.315–27 can also meaningfully be seen as depending on the mythological catalogue of *Gilg.* SBV VI.¹⁸⁵ An answer can again be given in the affirmative, not least because it is possible to see a chain of receptions between these texts featuring successive poetic reversals. These reversals concern, first, who performs the toilette and dressing; second, who propositions whom; third, whether or not the proposition is accepted; and fourth, where there is a mythological catalogue, who delivers it, and to what purpose. The reception is already under way in *Gilg.* SBV, which appears to engage allusively with Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna songs. We will take in turn the Dumuzi–Inanna songs, *Gilg.* SBV VI, *Haph*, and the *Diosapate* (regarding *Haph* as motivationally prior to the *Iliad*).

¹⁸³ In general, Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 163: 'Verminderung eines Hauptträgers des Geschehens ins Episodische'; *ibid.* 195–6: Homer "entwurzelt", "enttatsächlicht" 'Motive der Vorlage'; Reinhardt 1960 (1938): 27 = 1997: 182: 'What was formerly a story returns as a situation', 1960 (1938): 29 = 1997: 184: 'The old motif becomes insubstantial'; *cf.* 1961: 447, on the *Iliad*'s transformation of the traditional Titanomachy; J. Griffin 1980a: 185; Hölscher 1978: 60–6; Schein 1984: 29.

¹⁸⁴ For the degree of 'functionality' ('significance', 'appropriateness') of a given motif in a given narrative context as a means of distinguishing primary and secondary uses, see Willcock 1987: 193: 'As a general principle, the more significant is likely to be the original; the less significant the copy'; Kullmann 1960: 16; *cf.* 31–2, 208, 260, 263, 264, 275–6, 315, etc.; D. L. Cairns 2001: 43; Burgess 2006a: 159. The principle criticized: Dihle 1970: 12; Erbse 1993: 397 n. 20; Kelly 2006: 3; Cook 2009: 136.

¹⁸⁵ Differently, Kelly 2008: 289–90.

In the Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna songs, Inanna performs the toilette, Dumuzi propositions her, and his proposition is accepted, with sexual intercourse immediately ensuing. There is no mythological catalogue.

In *Gilg.* SBV VI, Gilgamesh washes, Ishtar propositions him, but her proposition is rejected—so no intercourse follows. In each of these three elements we have an exact reversal of the Dumuzi–Inanna songs. We now also get a mythological catalogue of Ishtar’s former lovers, delivered by Gilgamesh, which furnishes negative mythological examples to justify Gilgamesh in rejecting Ishtar’s advances: Gilgamesh is determined not to suffer the fates of Dumuzi, Ishullanu, and the others. It is unclear whether the mythological catalogue can be regarded as an original contribution of Sîn-lēqi-unninni’s version of *Gilgamesh*.¹⁸⁶ Whether that is the case or not, it appears to be an elaboration that serves to annotate and call attention to that most striking reversal of the situation in the Dumuzi–Inanna songs: the rejection of Ishtar’s invitation to sexual intercourse. It was argued in § 5.9 that this mythological catalogue is highly sophisticated and poetically self-conscious; it inscribes within the poem its own relationship with earlier poetry, signalling its dependence on Dumuzi–Inanna poetry; and by embedding a further narrative, the Ishullanu (Shukale-tuda) story, embellished with ad hoc mythological invention, it illustrates in miniature precisely the same subversion of a poetic model that is effected by the main narrative.

In *Haph*, Aphrodite performs the toilette and dressing and Anchises propositions her; his proposition is accepted, with sexual intercourse resulting. So far *Haph* replicates the Dumuzi–Inanna songs. But we also get a mythological catalogue spoken by Aphrodite, admittedly a ‘catalogue’ of the shortest possible form (two exempla).¹⁸⁷ This mythological catalogue invokes a two-fold precedent.¹⁸⁸ First, a positive example: Zeus’ erstwhile passion for Gany-medes is invoked to justify Aphrodite’s falling in love with a mortal of the same family. Second, a negative one: the precedent of Eos falling in love with Tithonos and failing to make him ageless urges Aphrodite to a different course

¹⁸⁶ Tigay 1982: 174–5: ‘Within the evolution of *The Gilgamesh Epic*, this passage [*sc.* *Gilg.* SBV VI.1–21] may be an innovation of the Akkadian version. Nothing in the preserved parts of the Sumerian source of Tablet VI, *Gilgamesh and the Bull of Heaven*, resembles the proposal.’ Differently, George 1999: 167: ‘In the long lacuna [*sc.* in the Sumerian version] that follows one may imagine that [Gilgamesh] poured scorn on [Ishtar], perhaps also listing the fate of her former conquests as in the Babylonian epic.’ On the unclear implications of the presence of the mythological catalogue in *Gilg.* MB Emar₂, cf. George 2003: i.331–3, 295–7. There is no mythological catalogue in the Hittite and Ugaritic receptions of the ‘plaint in heaven’ motif in the *Song of Ullikummi* or *Aqhat*. There is a curious analogue in a Hurro-Hittite Hymn to Ishtar, but without the distinctive mythological component: Güterbock 1984: 158, 164; Wilhelm 1994: 72 (I am grateful to Dr Christopher Metcalf for this reference).

¹⁸⁷ For *Haph* 202–38 and also *Od.* 5.121–8 (Kalypso’s enumeration of two exempla) as ‘catalogues’, see Sowa 1984: 57–60; Sammons 2010: 51–2; cf. 9 and n. 23.

¹⁸⁸ Differently, on Aphrodite’s exempla of Ganymedes and Tithonos, Smith 1981a: 69–90.

of action with Anchises: she will abandon him immediately after their sexual intercourse. This negative example is (humorously) illogical: there is no reason why Aphrodite could not have learned from Eos' error, no reason why, armed with the hindsight that Eos lacked, she must repeat the mistake that Eos made.¹⁸⁹ The lack of objective compulsion in this precedent emerges from a comparison with Kalypso's proposal to make Odysseus 'ageless and immortal' (*Od.* 5.136, 209), despite her knowledge of inauspicious precedents ($\Rightarrow$ *Od.* 5.121–8). *HApH* seems to follow *Gilg.* SBV VI in including a mythological catalogue. If so, we would have a $\rightarrow$ conflation of sources: *HApH* follows the Dumuzi–Inanna songs for the goddess's toilette, the male's propositioning of the female, and the sexual intercourse ensuing, but follows *Gilg.* SBV VI for the mythological catalogue. (This is perhaps not the only place where *Gilg.* SBV VI is a model for *HApH*, for *HApH* 56–7 'Laughter-loving Aphrodite saw him and fell in love' is suggestively close to *Gilg.* SBV VI.6 'On the beauty of Gilgamesh Lady Ishtar looked with longing.') We might say that *HApH*'s reception of the Dumuzi–Inanna songs is not simply direct, but mediated in part by *Gilg.* SBV's own reception of the Dumuzi–Inanna songs. Accordingly, we might say that *HApH* returns to the model of its model by the double operation of $\rightarrow$ opposition in imitation, inverting its immediate 'exemplar's' inversion of its 'exemplar'. (The use of the word 'exemplar' here is not meant to imply the use of written texts.) Or we might say that the Dumuzi–Inanna songs appear to be the overall model for *HApH*, but *Gilg.* SBV VI to be the model specifically for the mythological catalogue. In including the mythological catalogue, *HApH* 'looks through the "window"' of *Gilg.* SBV VI to the original situation of the Dumuzi–Inanna songs—or that, at any rate, is what a Latinist might want to say if these were Greek and Latin, not Sumerian, Akkadian, and Greek texts; at the end of this section, we will consider the appropriateness of the model to our kind of texts.¹⁹⁰ In its handling of the details of the mythological catalogue *HApH* could be said to invert *Gilg.* SBV VI in three ways. First, in *HApH* the catalogue is spoken by the goddess, not, as in *Gilg.* SBV VI, by her human

¹⁸⁹ The illogicality of Aphrodite's reasoning: Smith 1981a: 87–90; Sammons 2010: 51–2; Carrara 2011: 98 and n. 42; Olson 2012: 245, 253–4. It is possible to repair the logic by supposing that Aphrodite could only make Anchises immortal by appealing to Zeus, which she is unable to do: Clay 1989: 190, de Jong 1989: 22 n. 29; cf. N. J. Richardson 2010: 250. But there is no reason to suppose that deities could not make mortals immortal on their own initiative: cf. Artemis and Iphigeneia/Iphimede (*Cypria* p. 41 Bernabé, 'Hes.' fr. 23a.24, 23b M–W), Athene and Diomedes (*Thebais* fr. 9 Bernabé), Kalypso and Odysseus (*Od.* 5.209), Aphrodite and Phaëthon (Hes. *Th.* 991), Demeter and Demophon (*HDem* 242, 260–1), Thetis and Peleus (Eur. *Andr.* 1255–6); Eos' appeal to Zeus for Memnon's immortality (*Aethiopis* pp. 68–9 Bernabé) does not have the status of a rule. Differently, Walcot 1991: 150–1.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. R. F. Thomas 1986: 188–9, on Virg. *Geo.* 1.373–82 as looking through the 'window' of Varro of Atax to Aratus; cf. Pasquali 1951 (1942): 17–19; Clausen 1987: 20. Similar is the notion of 'two-tier allusion': Hinds 1987: 151 n. 16 and 'Index of Subjects' s.v. 'allusion, "two-tier"'; Nelis 2001: *passim*, esp. 247–8.

beloved. Second, the first of the two mythological precedents (Zeus and Ganymedes) adduced in *Haph* justifies Aphrodite in having sexual intercourse with Anchises; this positive example thus contrasts with Gilgamesh's use of negative mythological examples to justify not having sex with Ishtar. Third, Aphrodite's second mythological precedent (Eos and Tithonos) justifies Aphrodite in forsaking Anchises immediately after the intercourse; this negative example thus urges Aphrodite to precisely the course of action for which Gilgamesh reviles Ishtar in his catalogue of negative examples, loving her men and leaving them. At the same time, the mythical example of Tithonos closely approaches the mythical exempla of Gilgamesh's catalogue: here we have a mortal who suffers for being loved by a goddess. So, *Haph* appears to follow both Dumuzi–Inanna and *Gilg*. SBV, the latter with plentiful inversion.

In *Iliad* XIV, Hera performs the toilette and dressing, and Zeus propositions her; his proposition is accepted, with intercourse immediately resulting. Thus far *Iliad* XIV follows the pattern of *Haph*, which follows in turn the Dumuzi–Inanna songs. The roles are transferred, however, from the love goddess and her shepherd lover to Hera and Zeus.¹⁹¹ Lastly, Zeus speaks the mythological catalogue, citing his lust for his own previous lovers as a positive example for sleeping with Hera on the spot.¹⁹² Like Aphrodite's catalogue in *Haph*, Zeus' catalogue is illogical or at any rate astonishingly ill-advised: readers since antiquity have noticed that the rehearsal of his extramarital affairs is not calculated to put Hera in the mood for love.¹⁹³ As with the illogicality in Aphrodite's use of mythological precedent, this may be held to argue an ironic or self-conscious use of the motif.¹⁹⁴ The *Dios apate* inverts *Haph* by restoring the mythological catalogue to the male partner, as in *Gilgamesh*. But the *Iliad* also sides with *Haph*, and against *Gilgamesh*, in having the speaker of the catalogue adduce positive examples in favour of sexual intercourse. We have already considered (§ 5.5) ways in which the mythological catalogue of *Iliad* XIV is in a subversive dialogue with *Haph*; it was pointed out that, for instance, Zeus' present desire for Hera exceeds his previous desires for other women, not vice versa, as in *Haph*. Another notable irony is that Hera's seduction of Zeus is motivated by *hatred* of her spouse (*Il.* 14.157–8), rather than lust for a man who has only just caught the goddess' attention (*Gilg.* SBV VI.6; *Haph* 56–7).¹⁹⁵ (As well as being in this intertextual chain, Zeus' speech

¹⁹¹ There may also be (indirect) influence here from Sumerian poetry on the 'sacred marriage' of Enlil and Ninlil (the head of the Mesopotamian pantheon and his wife); for the poems *Enlil and Ninlil* and *Enlil and Sud*, see Black et al. 2004: 102–6, 106–11.

¹⁹² Burkert 1992: 93; cf. Janko 1992: 202.

¹⁹³ Σ A *Il.* 14.317 ἄκαιρος ἢ ἀπαριθμήσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἀλλοτριῶι τὴν Ἥραν ἢ προσάγεται. Cf. M. W. Edwards 1987a: 249; Janko 1992: 201.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Sammons 2010: 65–6, for a different account of Zeus' rhetoric and of the irony of the passage.

¹⁹⁵ Hera as moved by hate, not love: Erbse 1970: 96–7; Sowa 1984: 73–4.

to Hera is intratextually linked to Paris' speech to Helene at *Il.* 3.441–7: in each of these scenes, an embittered couple, one human, one divine, is brought to the act of love-making through Aphrodite's agency; but the contrast between the two scenes is also important.)¹⁹⁶

The preceding is to show that the mythological catalogues of *Haph* 202–40 and *Il.* 14.315–27 can meaningfully be seen as depending on the mythological catalogue of *Gilg.* SBV VI. This way of viewing the various passages—admittedly not the way we are accustomed to view them—implies a picture of progressive receptions of a narrative sequence with conflation and reversal of accumulated 'sources'.¹⁹⁷ This picture would argue a complex and sophisticated allusive relationship of each text with one or more of its predecessors; the question of who was able to pick up on the dialogue will be addressed at the end of the chapter, § 5.19. The argument that these two early Greek hexameter compositions (*Haph* and the Iliadic *Dios apate*) are in dialogue with Near Eastern compositions derives further support from the apparent presence in each of other elements with an apparent Near Eastern orientation. The Near Eastern orientation of *Haph* was treated earlier (§ 5.8). In the *Dios apate*, several Near Eastern elements have been identified: Aphrodite's girdle, the division of the cosmos by lot, and Tethys and Okeanos as → 'equivalents' of Tiamat and Apsu.¹⁹⁸

We have seen an argument that the mythological catalogues of *Haph* 202–40 and *Il.* 14.315–27 can be meaningfully interpreted as depending on *Gilg.* SBV VI.45–79. This argument of literary interpretability needs to be joined with an argument for historical plausibility. In the case of Greek-to-Latin chains of reception featuring 'window reference', we are dealing with definite and tangible source-texts (say Aratus' *Phaenomena* and Varro's

¹⁹⁶ *Il.* 3.441–442a, 446 = 14.314–315a, 328. This may be viewed as an instance of (two-way) 'paradigmatic mirroring'; cf. Lohmann 1970: 187. The contrast between the scenes: Macleod 1983: 10: 'In love..., as in other things, the ease and gaiety of Olympians sets in relief the compulsions and the painfulness of mortal existence.'

¹⁹⁷ → Contamination and → opposition in imitation.

¹⁹⁸ Rollinger 2011: 223–4. Aphrodite's girdle: Burkert 1992: 93; Faraone 1999: 101–4, esp. 101–2; cf. Faraone 1990: 222–9. Differently, Kelly 2008: 286–9. Division of cosmos: Burkert 1992: 90–1; M. L. West 1997: 109–10. Differently, Kelly 2008: 262–73; Lane Fox 2008: 354–5. Tethys and Okeanos: Burkert 1992: 91–3; M. L. West 1997: 147; Bremmer 2008: 1–4; Sammons 2010: 69. Kelly 2008: 275–85 denies that Okeanos–Tethys are cosmogonic primeval parents and correspond to Apsu–Tiamat. But Okeanos and Tethys appear to be primeval parents at *Il.* 14.201, 246; cf. *OF* 22F Bernabé; see M. L. West 1983: 118–20. To limit the reference of *Il.* 14.246 πάντεσσι to 'all <rivers>' (Kelly 2008: 276–9; cf. Kirk–Raven–Schöfield 1983: 14) makes the rhetoric of *Il.* 14.244–6 bathetic: 'any other of the gods, ... even Okeanos, who is the origin of all'—sc. rivers. *Il.* 14.206–7, 305–6 may allude to the cosmic separation of the primeval divine couple: compare the 'waters' of *Genesis* 1:6–8 (Kirk–Raven–Schöfield 1983: 43–6, 10–17). The 'quarrels' (*Il.* 14.205, 304) and 'long separation' (206, 305) of Okeanos and Tethys invite comparison with the 'quarrel' and 'separation' of cosmic parents (Emped. fr. 17 D–K; Eur. fr. 484 *TGrF*; A.R. 1.496–8); Huxley 1969: 20–4; M. L. West 1983: 120–1; Burkert 1992: 91–2; Alster 1999b: 868–9.

Ephemeris) that were indubitably known to the receiving author (say Virgil in the *Georgics*) and where it is no stretch of the imagination to think that he was sensitive to the details of the reception of the earlier source-text by the later. In our case the imagination is considerably more stretched. For one thing, the source-texts are intangible: the poets of *HApH* and *Iliad* hardly knew our extant texts of Dumuzi-Inanna poetry, and it can be doubted whether they knew the Standard Babylonian *Gilgamesh*: simply, we do not know what they knew, or in what language. The preceding argument asks us to imagine that they knew something (linguistically accessible, whether oral or written) that was very like the texts we now have. And it asks us to imagine that they knew not just the poems, but their literary interrelationships: how *Gilg.* SBV interacts with certain key earlier texts. If we are to credit eighth-seventh-century Greek poets with such understanding, then we must presuppose that the *Gilgamesh* epic was also capable of being appreciated in these terms in the Near East, in some circles at least, in the first millennium BC, and there is no evidence that this was so.¹⁹⁹ It is clear, therefore, that this literary argument is implicated in various historical unknowns. The question is whether the literary argument should incline us to entertain the historical unknowns, or whether the historical unknowns should make us reject the literary argument. This is another dilemma to which we will return at the end of the chapter (§ 5.19), after first seeing where the literary argument may lead us.

III. MYTHOLOGICAL CATALOGUES, SEDUCTIONS, PLAINTS IN HEAVEN: TYPOLOGY OR ALLUSION?

5.12 Specific Allusion versus Topos

The preceding discussion revolved around three motifs: the toilette or bath as a prelude to seduction, the catalogue of previous lovers, and the plaint in heaven. Each of these has a wide distribution in Near Eastern and Greek poetry. The wide distribution and variety of applications of the motifs problematize the attempt to derive certain of the uses from others. Reflecting on the miscellaneous points of contact between the theogonic myths in various Near Eastern texts and early Greek hexameter poems (Hesiod's *Theogony*; the 'Orphic' *Theogony* in the Derveni papyrus), W. Burkert said:

¹⁹⁹ Cf. George 2001: i.35: 'To what extent, if at all, Babylonian narrative poems of the written tradition were still living literature in the mid-first millennium is unknown.'

We finally begin to hear a many-voiced interplay of Sumerian, Akkadian, Hittite and West Semitic texts, all of which seem to have some connection with Hesiod. It is impossible, however, to construct a convincing stemma of these relations; perhaps it would not even make sense to try.²⁰⁰

In general, the greater the → frequency of a motif, the greater the tendency to view it as a traditional motif.²⁰¹ That tendency should not always go unchecked, however. We should consider what S. E. Hinds has said of the “many mouths” motif in Latin poetry:

faced with a Babel of claims and counter-claims to specific allusive interpretability coming from untidily proliferating sources, the commentator capitulates, deciding that the motif in question is so common—such a *topos*, as the term has it—as to forfeit any potential to be treated as more than merely inert.²⁰²

‘But,’ continues Hinds, ‘this is a counsel of despair.’²⁰³ Hinds defends the possibility of specific allusive interpretability, and also questions the strict dichotomy between the ‘stemmatic’ approach (a series of specific and pointed allusions) and the ‘topos’ approach: what we are apt to think of as an ‘inert’ topos can be allusive and dynamic even without being a specific allusion.

Let us consider our three motifs again in order: the catalogue of lovers (§ 5.13), the toilette as a prelude to seduction (§ 5.14), and the plaint in heaven (§ 5.15).

5.13 The Mythological Catalogue Again

It was suggested earlier (§§ 5.10–11) that the mythological catalogues at *HApH* 202–40, *Il.* 5.385–404, and *Il.* 14.315–27 are in a chain of reception depending on the mythological catalogue of *Gilg.* SBV VI. Another mythological catalogue is delivered by Kalypso in the fifth book of the *Odyssey*:

- ὥς μὲν ὅτ’ Ὠρίων’ ἔλετο ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως,
τόφρα οἱ ἡγάασθε θεοὶ ῥεῖα ζῶοντες,
ἔως μιν ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ χρυσόθρονος Ἄρτεμις ἀγνή
οἷσ’ ἀγανοῖσι βέλεσσιν ἐποιχομένη κατέπεφνε.
125 ὥς δ’ ὅπότ’ Ἰασίωνι εὐπλόκαμος Δημήτηρ,
ᾧ θυμῷ εἷξασα, μίγη φιλότῃτι καὶ εὐνῇ
νειῶ ἐνι τριπόλῳ· οὐδὲ δὴν ἦεν ἄπυστος
Ζεὺς, ὅς μιν κατέπεφνε βαλὼν ἀργῇτι κεραυνῷ.

²⁰⁰ Burkert 1987: 22 = 2003: 61. Cf. Faraone 1995: 327.

²⁰¹ Mueller 2009: 153: ‘The more often a phrase is repeated the less sense it makes to ask about its specific function in any particular context.’ Cf. Burgess 2006a: 157; 2009: 62–3; Irvin 1978: 114. See Appendix F.

²⁰² Hinds 1998: 39. The motif: *Il.* 2.488–90; Ennius *Ann.* 469–70 Skutsch; ‘Lucretius’ in Servius on Virg. *Geo.* 2.42, *Aen.* 6.625; Hostius fr. 3 Courtney; Virg. *Aen.* 6.625–7; cf. *Geo.* 2.43–4; Ov. *Tr.* 1.5.53–8.

²⁰³ Hinds 1998: 40. Cf. D. P. Fowler 1997: 20 = 2000a: 123 and n. 11.

So when rose-fingered Eos chose Orion,
 you gods who live at ease begrudged her,
 until in Ortygia pure Artemis of the golden throne
 assailed her with her arrows that bring a painless death and slew her.

- 125 And so when with Iasion fair-tressed Demeter
 surrendered to her passion and joined in love and intercourse
 in a thrice-ploughed fallow field; not for long was Zeus unaware,
 for he slew him, striking him with a glancing lightning bolt.
 (*Odyssey* 5.121–8)

Kalypso refers to other goddesses (Eos, Demeter) who in the past were not permitted to enjoy the love of mortal men (Orion, Iasion), just as she is prevented from enjoying the love of Odysseus.²⁰⁴ The situation of Kalypso with Odysseus roughly replicates that of Ishtar with Gilgamesh in *Gilg.* and of Aphrodite with Anchises in *HApH*: a goddess falls in love with a mortal man and the two part, with greater or lesser acrimony (in *Gilg.*, prior to any sexual relations occurring).²⁰⁵ As in *HApH*, but unlike *Gilg.*, this catalogue is delivered by the goddess; and unlike Aphrodite in *HApH*, but like Ishtar in *Gilg.*, the goddess is upset, though from a different cause (anger at the male Olympians in *Odyssey* V, anger at Gilgamesh in *Gilg.*). There are what we may consider family resemblances between all these scenes: a basic idea is varied, changes rung on a single theme.²⁰⁶ The basic idea is a catalogue of previous love affairs between goddesses and mortals with, on the whole, unhappy consequences for the mortals (Dumuzi and others in *Gilg.*, Tithonos in *HApH*, Orion and Iasion in *Odyssey* V). This may be broadened out (in *Iliad* XIV) to love affairs between a male god (Zeus) and mortal and immortal females. And it may be extended (in *Iliad* V) to encounters between immortals and mortals of a violent rather than a romantic nature, with (implicitly) unhappy consequences for the mortals.²⁰⁷ The scope for variation here is considerable, but it seems fair to say that the variation occurs on given themes and within certain parameters.

²⁰⁴ On Kalypso's catalogue, cf. Sammons 2010: 38–53. Scodel 2002: 145–7 discusses the exempla of *Iliad* V, *Iliad* XIV, and *Odyssey* V.

²⁰⁵ M. L. West 1997: 411–12; Loudon 2011: 128–31.

²⁰⁶ → Ringing the changes. Differently, Kelly 2008: 289–90. On the similarities between the various catalogues, see Sammons 2010: 40 (Kalypso's and Dione's), 51 (Kalypso's and Aphrodite's), 64, 100 (Zeus', Kalypso's, and Dione's). The form *θεαῖς* in both *HApH* 190 and *Od.* 5.119 may argue dependence of one on the other: Faulkner 2008: 32.

²⁰⁷ At *Il.* 6.128–41, the example of Lykourgos seems to make explicit what was understood in the examples of *Il.* 5.385–404; cf. Scodel 2002: 147.

Let us compare Hinds's discussion of the 'many mouths' motif in Latin poetry.²⁰⁸ Hinds recognizes in the uses of this motif 'a stable set of parameters...within which endlessly active (and endlessly interpretable) allusive variation can be contained'.²⁰⁹ He sees *Iliad* 2.488–90 'as inaugurating a system of cues—a code' for the poets down to and including Virgil who employ the motif.²¹⁰ We might think of seeing *Gilg.* SBV VI.45–79 as doing something similar for the mythological catalogue with the early Greek hexameter poets. The motif introduced by *Gilg.* SBV would then have become the object of restless 'allusive variation' without attention being paid to the specific poetic contexts in which the motif had been deployed. Yet on closer inspection the mythological catalogue seems not to work like that. *Gilg.* SBV VI itself draws on the specific situation in the Dumuzi–Inanna songs. *Haph* draws on the specific situation in the Dumuzi–Inanna songs, arguably through the 'window' of *Gilg.* SBV VI (see § 5.11). And *Iliad* XIV draws on the specific situation in *Haph* (or its pre-Homeric forerunner). The operation of 'window reference' and of opposition in imitation argues that these receptions are to be viewed in a set sequence, and, crucially, it is a set sequence that is interpretable. The mythological catalogues in *Iliad* V and *Odyssey* V stand outside the intricate chain of reception that we can see running through Dumuzi–Inanna, *Gilg.*, *Haph*, and *Iliad* XIV, but they, too, seem to depend on the specific situation of *Gilg.* SBV VI. The mythological exempla of Orion and Iasion in Kalypso's catalogue present, along with the Tithonos example in *Haph*, the closest approximation of all to the exempla of *Gilg.* SBV VI, in that Orion and Iasion are afflicted human lovers of goddesses, while the hunter Orion resembles specifically the 'shepherd' in Gilgamesh's catalogue (*Gilg.* SBV VI.58–63).²¹¹ Moreover, in the *Odyssey* as a whole Odysseus seems to be cast as a 'Gilgamesh' figure (among others: he is also cast as an Achilles figure, a Herakles figure, and a Iason figure); and so it makes sense to see the situation of Ishtar and Gilgamesh evoked in that of Kalypso and Odysseus in *Odyssey* V.²¹² Similarly, we have seen that Dione's mythological catalogue in *Iliad* V comes in a narrative context that evokes more of the specific context of *Gilg.* SBV V than meets the eye (see § 5.10). It is instructive to see how these Greek and Mesopotamian examples can resist analysis as 'merely a topos'; the

²⁰⁸ Hinds 1998: 41–7.

²⁰⁹ Hinds 1998: 42. In Hinds' example, the permutations concern: the number of mouths (10, 100, 'many'), the metal specified (bronze, iron), the organ mentioned (heart, voice).

²¹⁰ Hinds 1998: 42.

²¹¹ The 'shepherd' of *Gilg.* SBV VI.58–63 and the hunters Aktaion, Adonis, Orion, Daphnis: Stinton 1965: 45 = 1990: 51 and n. 14; Burkert 1983: 115–16; George 2003: i.473; cf. Fontenrose 1981: *passim* (with the reservations of R. T. C. Parker 1983). Orion as hunter: *Od.* 11.572–5.

²¹² M. L. West 1997: 402–17 (esp. 410–12, on Odysseus and Kalypso). We are invited to compare Odysseus and Gilgamesh as heroes, as we are Odysseus and Achilles (§ 2.1); the *Iliad* had already invited us to compare Achilles and Gilgamesh as heroes (§ 5.19).

case for (a meaningful) specific allusion remains. Rather than resembling the Virgilian and pre-Virgilian uses of the Homeric “many mouths” motif, then, what we have would more closely resemble the Ovidian use (*Tristia* 1.5.53–8) discussed by Hinds, where there is allusive dialogue with the specific situation in the specific poem drawn on (*Il.* 2.488–90).²¹³ It has been argued that in our passages ‘the catalogue form on every level has been completely integrated into [the Greek epic] tradition’.²¹⁴ But it would be possible to maintain that, on the contrary, *Gilg.* SBV VI.45–79 (or something very like it) is not lost sight of as an ‘exemplar’ from which the others depend.

This argument can be put in a further perspective by considering a passage from Hellenistic hexameter poetry. In Theocritus’ first *Idyll*, Daphnis’ vituperation of Aphrodite includes a mythological catalogue of the previous men in her life (105–13):

- 105 οὐ λέγεται τὰν Κύπριν ὁ βουκόλος; ἔρπε ποτ’ Ἰδαν,
 ἔρπε ποτ’ Ἀγχίσαν· τῆνέι δρύες ἦδὲ κύπειρος,
 αἱ δὲ καλὸν βομβεῦντι ποτὶ σμάνεσσι μέλισσαι.
 ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι, πάλιν ἄρχετ’ ἀοιδᾶς.
 ὠραίους χῶδωνις, ἔπει καὶ μῆλα νομεύει
 110 καὶ πτόκας βάλλει καὶ θηρία πάντα διώκει.
 ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι, πάλιν ἄρχετ’ ἀοιδᾶς.
 αὐτίς ὅπως στασῇ Διομήδεος ἄσσον ἰοῖσα,
 καὶ λέγε “τὸν βούταν νικῶ Δάφνιν, ἀλλὰ μάχου μοι.”

- 105 ‘Isn’t the cowherd said [to have tugged] the Cyprian? Get off to Ida,
 get off to Anchises. There there are oaks and galingale,
 and the bees buzz beautifully by the hives.’
 Begin, Muses, begin again a bucolic song.
 ‘Adonis too is in his prime; since he pastures flocks
 110 and pelts hares and chases all kinds of beasts.’
 Begin, Muses, begin again a bucolic song.
 ‘Go again and take your stand by Diomedes
 and say, “I got the better of the cowherd Daphnis, come fight with me.”’

This mythological catalogue (in character-text, as always) serves to inscribe Daphnis in a literary tradition: he is successor to Anchises, Adonis, and Diomedes.²¹⁵ Hellenistic *epyllion* here parades as a continuator of early Greek *epos*.²¹⁶ Daphnis’ catalogue wears an explicitly allusive character,

²¹³ Hinds 1998: 44. ²¹⁴ Kelly 2008: 290.

²¹⁵ Halperin 1983: 189; Hunter 1999: 68.

²¹⁶ Theocritus and Homer: Hunter 1996: 90–2.

being introduced with the Alexandrian footnote οὐ λέγεται...; (105).²¹⁷ Specific allusion is clear, both to the Aphrodite–Anchises affair (as narrated in *HApH*) and to the encounter between Aphrodite and Diomedes (as narrated in *Iliad* V). The adverb αἰτίς, ‘again’ (112), points up the allusion to the *Iliad*.²¹⁸ The referencing of the Greek epic tradition is here manifest. (Much more dimly, *Gilgamesh*, too, has been thought to stand in the background.)²¹⁹ The presence of Anchises, Adonis, and Diomedes in Daphnis’ mythological catalogue to indicate Daphnis’ literary predecessors resembles Dumuzi and Ishullanu in *Gilgamesh*’s mythological catalogue to indicate *Gilgamesh*’s (see § 5.9). Despite the great chronological extension, it is possible to see a continuum here: a ‘tradition’. It is striking how the mythological catalogue can be said to be used in a self-consciously intertextual manner in all of *Gilgamesh* SBV VI, *Iliad* V and XIV, *Odyssey* V, *HApH*, and Theocritus 1. The allusive poetics of Alexandrian hexameter poetry are different from those of early Greek hexameter poetry, but they are so, arguably, more by degree than kind.²²⁰ Theocritus can be ascribed an understanding of how the mythological catalogue works in early hexameter poetry that is very much in line with the way that it is understood in this chapter.

I have argued that the recurrences of the mythological catalogue may be seen as a series of specific reprises, but a typological explanation has also been given. A. Kelly characterized the mythological catalogues as ‘separate mythical events of a particular type [ordered] in a series’, and saw behind them just one of the most basic and general structuring principles of Greek epic at work, the catalogue form.²²¹ It needs, however, to be emphasized that these mythological catalogues have several features uniquely in common with one another beyond the bare catalogue form. First, context: all come in narratives of seduction scenes. Second, content: nearly all list love affairs of gods and mortals. Third, form: all are in character-text. And fourth, self-consciousness: the speaker reads off the exempla as if from a compendium of mythology, and the text situates itself thereby in a mythological or poetic tradition (Theocr. 1.105–13 makes the tendency explicit).²²² The scenes we are interested in form a distinct and cohesive group, which should not be lumped together with the list of heroines in the ‘Hesiodic’ *Catalogue of Women*, the

²¹⁷ ‘Alexandrian footnote’: Hinds 1998: 1–3 (after Ross 1975).

²¹⁸ → Words of iteration.

²¹⁹ Halperin 1983: 189; Hunter 1999: 96; cf. 68; in general, J. Griffin 1992: esp. 190 and n. 5.

²²⁰ Cf. § 1.5, pp. 25–6.

²²¹ Kelly 2008: 290 and n. 105, picking up on M. L. West 1997: 384.

²²² Sammons 2010: 68 ‘Zeus’ catalogue of lovers also opens up a window on the mythological past. Indeed, the offspring of his unions with mortal women, though mentioned in a casual way, read like a “who’s who” of the heroic age; cf. *ibid.* 22, 54–7, 209. Compare → ‘poetic memory’: characters’ recollection of the past mirrors the audience’s recollection of poetry. Note, relatedly, the presence of → ‘when’-words (cf. § 4.9) in the mythological catalogues: *Il.* 5.385, 392, 396; 14.317, 319, 321, 323, 326–7; cf. 3.443; *Od.* 5.121, 125.

list of amorous unions at the end of Hesiod's *Theogony*, the 'Catalogue of Heroines' in *Odyssey* XI, or the adventures recounted by Odysseus in his *Apologue*.²²³ It is important not to describe our scenes, the mythological catalogues, at too high a level of generality (as instances simply of the 'catalogue form'). It may well be that catalogues in themselves are a traditional element of early Greek and other epic traditions, but that does not touch the essential point: that these scenes (*Gilg.* SBV VI, *Iliad* V and XIV, *Odyssey* V, *HAph*) are unified by much more than the basic catalogic element.²²⁴ Once again, the recurrent features that interest us must be supervenient on any typological substructure. The typological substructure, if there is one, is insufficient to explain the recurrent features in which we are interested (compare § 5.1).

5.14 Bathing–Adornment–Seduction

It is time to consider the motif of bathing and dressing as a prelude to seduction.²²⁵ This motif is found quite widely in Near Eastern and Greek literature. We have already considered its occurrence in Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna songs (§ 5.8) and in *HAph*, *Iliad* XIV, and *Odyssey* XVIII (§ 5.3). In Akkadian mythological poetry it is found, apart from *Gilg.* SBV VI (§ 5.9), in the Standard Babylonian version of *Nergal and Ereshkigal* (viii–vii BC).²²⁶ In the first of two paired scenes, Ereshkigal, Mesopotamian goddess of the netherworld, bathes and dresses, but fails to make any impression on Nergal (*Nerg.-Eresh.* SBV III.(58'–(60')). In the second scene, she bathes and dresses and succeeds in seducing him; six days and nights of love-making ensue (*Nerg.-Eresh.* SBV IV.(4'–(13')). In the Hittite *Hedammu*, the goddess Ishtar/Shauska bathes and dresses in order to seduce Hedammu (Hoffner 1998: no. 17 §§ 11.2, 16.2). In *Ullikummi*, she bathes and dresses, but is obliged to abandon her intended seduction of the blind Ullikummi (Hoffner 1998: no. 18 § 35). In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus bathes and dresses and arouses the interest

²²³ Scodel 2002: 145: 'Catalogues of exempla are a special subgenre within the surviving epics.'

²²⁴ Janko 1992: 202 points out that Zeus' list of his lovers (*Il.* 14.315–27) 'definitely adapts traditional catalogue-poetry', but allows that 'Homer could be influenced by the catalogue of Ishtar's lovers in the *Epic of Gilgamesh* VI.'

²²⁵ Distinct is the motif of bathing and dressing unconnected with seduction, on which see Grethlein 2007; cf. Schwabl 1982: 31 n. 19. The 'bath' as a type-scene: Arend 1933: 124–6; J. M. Foley 1990: 248–57; cf. 1999: 185–6, 244–5; M. W. Edwards 1992: 306. In *Gilg.*, Gilgamesh also bathes at *Gilg.* SBV XI.262–70; his mother Ninsun bathes seven times and adorns herself in finery and jewels at *Gilg.* SBV III.37–41, prior to making an appeal to the sun god Shamash; this appears to have a quite different (ritual) background: George 2003: i.459.

²²⁶ This poem is distinct from the Middle Babylonian *Nergal and Ereshkigal*, which may also have influenced one of the 'seduction' episodes of the *Odyssey*: Nergal rushing at Ereshkigal with drawn sword (*Nerg.-Eresh.* MBV 77–87 = Foster 2005: 512) resembles Odysseus rushing similarly at Kirke (*Od.* 10.321–47): Crane 1988: 71–5; S. P. Morris 1997: 617; M. L. West 1997: 409; Bettini and Franco 2010: 150–1.

of Nausikaa (*Od.* 6.224–45; for a second time, 8.454–68); subsequently on Ithaca he bathes and dresses but fails to arouse the interest of Penelope (23.153–240; cf. 115–16). In both Near Eastern and Greek literature the seduction theme can therefore occur simply or complexly. When simple, the seduction may succeed (Inanna–Dumuzi, Aphrodite–Anchises, Hera–Zeus) or fail (Ishtar–Gilgamesh). When complex, it may first fail and then succeed or first succeed and then fail. We see the former (failure first) with Ereshkigal and Nergal. We see the latter (success first) with Ishtar/Shausika and Hedammu followed by Ishtar/Shausika and Ullikummi, with Odysseus and Nausikaa followed by Odysseus–Penelope, and with Shamhat and Enkidu (*Gilg.* SBV I.180–94: six days and seven nights of intercourse, as with round two of Ereshkigal and Nergal) followed by Ishtar and Gilgamesh.²²⁷

Are we dealing with a traditional scene or a series of specific reprises? It may seem implausible, if not misconceived, to attempt to relate these numerous scenes to one another, to construct a ‘stemma’ out of this plethora of occurrences. But it would again be premature to conclude that there can be no specific relationships between the scenes just because they are so numerous and messy, so ‘untidily proliferating’ (compare Hinds, cited in § 5.12).

Within the individual poetic contexts (i.e. viewed intratextually) there is excellent reason to see one deployment of the motif as primary, the other as secondary. The effect of the deployment of the motif in *Ullikummi* clearly depends on the prior deployment of the motif in *Hedammu* (this example is between intertextuality and intratextuality: both poems are part of a ‘Kumarbi Cycle’).²²⁸ Likewise with Ereshkigal and Nergal, the later deployment plays off the earlier. Similarly, the Odysseus–Penelope scene depends on the earlier Odysseus–Nausikaa scene.²²⁹ We see the inversions that we have come to expect: first, of outcome (success versus failure); and second, of gender: the male bathes and the erotic response comes (or fails to come) from the female (Gilgamesh–Ishtar, Odysseus–Nausikaa, Odysseus–Penelope).²³⁰ *Odyssey* 24.365–74, where Laertes bathes and makes a favourable impression on Odysseus, can be seen as a further extension of the sequence, despite its detachment from the seduction motif. Having first bathed and impressed a woman (Nausikaa, book VI), and having then bathed and failed to impress a woman (Penelope, book XXIII), Odysseus now finds himself impressed by a man who has bathed. The tables are thus turned on Odysseus, who is upstaged

²²⁷ Walls 2001: 34–7, on the parallels between the Shamhat–Enkidu and the Ishtar–Gilgamesh episodes.

²²⁸ Siegelová 1971: 83–4; Haas 2006: 157; I. C. Rutherford 2009: 23. More generally on the likely sequence of songs within the Kumarbi Cycle, Hoffner 1998: 40–2.

²²⁹ Schwabl 1982: 31–2; Pucci 1987: 91–2; R. B. Rutherford 1992: 57; de Jong 2001: 555.

²³⁰ These Odyssean scenes are compared with *Gilg.* SBV VI by M. L. West 1997: 413.

by his father in book XXIV as he was by his wife in book XXIII.²³¹ Odysseus' admiration of the transformed Laertes also recalls Telemachos' admiration of the transformed Odysseus in a further, related, context (*Od.* 24.370 θαύμαζε δέ μιν φίλος υἱός ~ 16.178 θάμβησε δέ μιν φίλος υἱός: surely a reprise and not—just—a formula). The scene at *Od.* 24.365–74 should thus be seen as specifically interacting with various preceding passages in the *Odyssey*.²³² This recurrence of the bathing scene gives no grounds to think that this is (just) a type-scene.²³³ What we see is, rather, a very characteristic interest in → ringing the changes on a particular motif: in this case, 'Odysseus bathes and becomes attractive.'

This leaves us to consider the situation across poems, i.e. intertextually. Is it possible to see the deployment of the motif in one poem as primary and secondary in another? Do we, in other words, find (allusive) motif transference, whereby the bathing–adornment–seduction motif becomes attached to other deities than the love goddess? Let us consider the Standard Babylonian poem *Nergal and Ereshkigal*, where it is possible to argue that the motif has indeed been allusively transferred from Ishtar to Ereshkigal, much as the motif is transferred from Aphrodite to Hera in the *Dios apate*.²³⁴ *Nerg.-Eresh.* SBV has, like *Gilg.* SBV, been seen as a highly allusive poem; among the poems to which it has been argued to allude are *Gilgamesh* and *Ishtar's Descent*.²³⁵ There are an impressive number of similarities between the three poems.²³⁶ *Nergal*, following his amorous exploits with Ereshkigal, is dubbed by the gods (mischievously, it seems) 'son of Ishtar' (*Nerg.-Eresh.* SBV IV.(29')).²³⁷ This

²³¹ Compare and contrast Heubeck 1992: 401: 'The bath scene (partly through the choice of words) deliberately recalls the parallel scenes of vi 224–5 (cf. also xviii 69–70) and xxiii 153–63. It is pointless to speculate about any one scene being derived from the others: each suits its own context.' For Penelope upstaging Odysseus (*Od.* 23.153–204), see R. B. Rutherford 1986: 160 = 2009: 182; cf. Hölscher 1988: 294–5; see Appendix F p. 260 n. 14.

²³² The argument does not require, but is very compatible with, the authenticity of *Odyssey* XXIV.

²³³ Cf. Schwabl 1982: 27–8, on a clothing 'formula' which occurs 15 times in *Odyssey*, but always of Odysseus: 'Handelt es sich nun um ein superbes Beispiel für eine traditionelle Gewandzene im Sinne Milman Parrys und seiner Theorie? Keineswegs! Alle fünfzehn Fälle haben mit Odysseus zu tun.' Cf. Schwabl 1990: 98.

²³⁴ English translation of *Nerg.-Eresh.* SBV: Foster 2005: 512–24. Ponchia and Luukko 2013 offer a composite transcription (whose principles are explained at *ibid.* 33, 64–6) with English translation and commentary.

²³⁵ Reiner 1985: 33; Walls 2001: 129, 143; cf. George 2003: i.474–5, 481; Lapinkivi 2010: 47. Differently, Hutter 1985: 60–4.

²³⁶ The goddess's threat to make the dead outnumber the living: *Gilg.* SBV VI.100 = *Ishtar's Descent* 19–20 = *Nerg.-Eresh.* SBV V.11'–12' (George 2003: i.474: 'the threat is traditionally Ištar's to make'). Description of the underworld: *Gilg.* SBV VII.184–92 ~ *Ishtar's Descent* (Nineveh) 4–11 ~ *Nerg.-Eresh.* SBV III.1'–5'. The line in which Ereshkigal propositions Nergal in the Middle Babylonian version of *Nergal and Ereshkigal* is identical to that in which Ishtar propositions Gilgamesh in *Gilg.* SBV VI: *Nerg.-Eresh.* MBV 83 = *Gilg.* SBV VI.9 (cf. already *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*: George 1999: 170; 2003: i.471–2).

²³⁷ [mār] ^di[š-ta]r (supplemented). Compare the periphrasis *mār šipri* 'son of sending', i.e. 'messenger', at i.13, 35, 39. Ea calls Nergal *mār harrāni*, 'son of the road', i.e. 'wayfarer', at ii.24 =

unusual designation for Nergal can hardly be taken literally, but it can attractively be taken as a → signal that Nergal is starring in an Ishtar-style narrative, a sexual escapade.²³⁸ B. R. Foster considers the possibility that '[Nerg.-Eresh. SBV] worked in liberal quotations from the same material used in the Descent of Ishtar, though in each instance with an interesting reversal of their application'.²³⁹ There is more generally a notable thematic complementarity between the two poems. In *Ishtar's Descent*, Ishtar encroaches on Ereshkigal's domain, apparently determined to usurp Ereshkigal's position as goddess of the underworld.²⁴⁰ In the Standard Babylonian *Nergal and Ereshkigal*, Ereshkigal may be seen as encroaching on Ishtar's domain by usurping Ishtar's prerogative of starring in narratives of seduction. The antagonistic → sibling relationship between the goddesses would suit an agonistic relationship between their respective poems, in their Standard Babylonian versions.²⁴¹ We might compare the antagonistic relationship of Aphrodite to both Hera and Athene, goddesses to whom seduction narratives are transferred in *Iliad* XIV and *Odyssey* XVIII respectively (see § 5.3). There are grounds, then, to entertain an allusive three-way relationship between *Ishtar's Descent*, *Gilgamesh*, and *Nergal and Ereshkigal*.

A comparable argument has been made for the three Akkadian poems *Anzu*, *Enuma elish*, and *Erra* by P. Machinist, who would see a complex literary dialogue of specific allusions, notwithstanding all three poems' indebtedness to 'more or less widespread story traditions or stocks of motifs'.²⁴² Machinist argues that 'the relationships [sc. between *Anzu*, *Enuma elish*, and *Erra*, in structure, language, characterization and themes] reflect a real intertextuality: a situation wherein *Anzu*, *Enuma elish*, and *Erra* were consciously composed each in response to, and in something like a structural transformation of, its predecessor(s)'.²⁴³ This is a most important perspective for our discussion, even if it does not have the status of a 'standard' view among Assyriologists (there is, of course, no such thing).²⁴⁴ In general, 'intertextuality' remains a vexed notion in Sumerology and Assyriology as in Homeric studies, and for quite similar reasons. There is no unanimity whether the reuse of phrases, etc.

37, according to the text translated by Foster 2005: 515, but that reading is questionable: Dalley 2000: 167, 168; Ponchia and Luukko 2013: 41.

²³⁸ Walls 2001: 147 'Nergal... receives a hero's welcome in heaven, where the gods celebrate his sexual prowess by hailing him as the "son of Ishtar"'; Pettinato 2000: 117; Ponchia and Luukko 2013: 55.

²³⁹ Foster 2005: 509; cf. 24. Cf. Reiner 1985: 53 and 59 n. 3, 54; Lapinkivi 2010: 47.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Penglase 1994: 25–6, 246–7; Alster 2011: 64, 68–9 (on the Sumerian *Inanna's Descent*).

²⁴¹ Ereshkigal and Ishtar: Lapinkivi 2010: 48. Leick 2001: 58, for Ereshkigal as Ishtar's sister and 'pale *alter ego*'.

²⁴² Machinist 2005: 57.

²⁴³ Machinist 2005: 58; cf. 60, 61; Lambert 1986, esp. 56. I am indebted here to Dr Selena Wisnom's work on intertextuality in Babylonian narrative poetry.

²⁴⁴ Machinist is followed by Frahm 2011: 348–9.

in Sumerian and Akkadian literature should be seen as a sign of formularity or of allusion.²⁴⁵ Nor have scholars' views of orality and literacy in Sumerian and Akkadian texts developed in isolation from Homeric studies.²⁴⁶ The fact that extant Akkadian literature is the product of a highly specialized and developed scribal milieu, a salient difference from early Greek epic, could be said to make it especially receptive to allusion.²⁴⁷

In any event, there is more to be said for the attempt to relate these numerous scenes of bathing–adornment–seduction to one another, as transferences or specific reprises, than first appeared. The motif appears primarily associated with Inanna in Sumerian poetry (Dumuzi–Inanna songs, Royal Hymns) and her → ‘equivalents’ in Hittite (Shaushka/Ishtar: *Hedammu*, *Ullikummi*) and in Greek (Aphrodite: *Haph*). By a pointed and signalled transference, it is attached to other goddesses than Inanna and her ‘equivalents’ (Ishtar, Shaushka, Aphrodite), viz. to Ereshkigal (*Nerg.-Eresh*. SBV) and Hera (*Iliad* XIV). In a further playful reversal, the bathing and adornment within the bathing–adornment–seduction motif is attached not to the love goddess, but to Gilgamesh in *Gilg*. SBV VI, when filthy from his heroic killing of Humbaba: Ishtar subsequently finds him attractive and marriageable. In a curiously parallel transference, the motif is attached to Odysseus (who is modelled in other ways on Gilgamesh): first, when filthy from the heroic completion of his wanderings, in *Odyssey* VI; and subsequently, when filthy from the heroic killing of the suitors, in *Odyssey* XXIII; in those scenes, respectively, Nausikaa finds him attractive and marriageable, while Penelope, in a typical twist, confounds both Odysseus' expectations and our own by being apparently left cold.

5.15 Complaint in Heaven

It remains to consider the ‘complaint in heaven’ motif.²⁴⁸ Apart from the Sumerian *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven* and the Standard Babylonian *Gilgamesh*, the motif of a character going to weep before a god occurs in various Akkadian texts, notably *Ishtar's Descent*, *Worm and Toothache*, and *The Fable of the Fox*. There is an apparently formulaic couplet associated with the motif: ‘x went into the

²⁴⁵ The problem in general: Hecker 1974: 161–2. On the one hand, emphasizing Sumerian poetry as oral, traditional, and formulaic: Alster 1972: 16–27; Ferrara 1995: 108. On the other hand, in support of allusion: Reiner 1985: 33, 50; Black 1998: 118–20, 138; Foster 2007: 113; cf. 2005: 22–6, esp. 24; Sallaberger 2008: 109; Patzek 2011: 395.

²⁴⁶ See e.g. Alster 1972; Russo 1992; Vogelzang and Vanstiphout 1992; Sasson 2005: 218.

²⁴⁷ Vanstiphout 1986: 224–7; Machinist 2005: 60–1; Haas 2006: 15.

²⁴⁸ Cf. M. L. West 1997: 180: ‘petulant goddesses’.

presence of *y* weeping, / in the presence of *y* his tears went (sc. flowed).²⁴⁹ *Gilg.* SBV VI.82–3 is called by A. R. George ‘a variation on a standard literary cliché’.²⁵⁰ We also find the motif in the Hittite *Song of Ullikummi*, of Ishtar/Shauskha having failed to seduce Ullikummi; and in the Ugaritic *Aqhat*, of Anat having had her offers rejected by Aqhat.²⁵¹

Once again, the question arises whether and how far the multiplication of instances problematizes the attempt to see specific allusion. It should first be said that the cross-cultural distribution of the motif does not automatically strengthen the case for seeing a topos. *Gilgamesh* manuscripts have been found at Hattusa (in Akkadian as well as in Hittite and Hurrian translation) and at Ugarit (in Akkadian).²⁵² The motif can thus be said to be far-flung, but in precisely the same way that the *Gilgamesh* epic itself is far-flung; the occurrence of the ‘plaint in heaven’ motif in Hittite and Ugaritic mythological poetic texts is very likely connected with the diffusion of the Mesopotamian epic itself. Scribes who had learned to write Hittite mythological poetry in cuneiform can be assumed to have been familiar with *Gilgamesh*.²⁵³ In this case, therefore, channels of transmission are historically well attested, and a key condition for positing literary influence is met.²⁵⁴

It is important also to note that the ‘plaint in heaven’ motif in Near Eastern mythological poetry is recurrently linked with two other motifs. First, with the motif of failed seduction. This is straightforwardly so in the case of Ishtar in *Gilg.* SBV VI and Ishtar/Shauskha in *Ullikummi*. It is less straightforward in the case of the Iliadic ‘plaint in heaven’ involving Aphrodite in *Iliad* V; but we have seen that that episode is indirectly, though significantly, associated with seduction scenes involving Aphrodite and Anchises, Paris and Helene (§ 5.10). The scene in *Aqhat* also resembles a seduction scene. Anat notices and conceives a passion for Aqhat’s bow (KTU 1.17.vi.10–19 = S. B. Parker 1997: 60: ‘Raising her eyes she sees... she longs for the bow’), much as Ishtar notices and conceives a passion for Gilgamesh himself (*Gilg.* SBV VI.6–21).²⁵⁵

²⁴⁹ *illik X ana pān Y ibakki / ana pān Y illakā dīmāšu: Worm and Toothache* 7–8 (Foster 2005: 995 no. IV.48.7–8); *Fable of Fox* I.i.78–9 (Kienast 2003: 38–9); cf. *Gilg.* SBV VII.91–2; *Etana* SBV II.59–60. Listed under ‘epische Formeln’ by Hecker 1974: 178–9.

²⁵⁰ George 2003: ii.839.

²⁵¹ *Song of Ullikummi*: Hoffner 1998: no. 18 § 37: ‘Tearful she set out [for ...].’ *Aqhat* KTU 1.17.vi.42–53 = S. B. Parker 1997: 62–3.

²⁵² Cf. George 2003: i.24. The Hittite *Gilgamesh*, cf. Beckman 2003; George 2003: i.306–26; Haas 2006: 272–7; Archi 2007. Hurrian: Archi 2007: 187. *Gilgamesh* at Ugarit, cf. George 1999: 139–40. Middle Babylonian poetry at Ugarit: Kämmerer 1998.

²⁵³ M. L. West 1997: 590; Bryce 2002: 59, 222–3, 260. In general, Beckman 1983: 98: ‘It must be stressed that the adoption of cuneiform implied the borrowing of an entire cultural tradition, and that, conversely, scribal education was the means by which that tradition was transmitted, both to the native Mesopotamian and to the foreigner’; cf. Haas 2006: 11–12.

²⁵⁴ ‘Channels of transmission’ as a criterion for identifying influence: Tigay 1993: 251 and n. 7, 255 and n. 28.

²⁵⁵ M. L. West 1997: 412.

Second, the 'plaint in heaven' motif is persistently linked with the motif of the threat of cosmic violence made by a slighted goddess against the sky god, who meekly yields to her requests. Thus the scorned Inanna threatens An in *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven* that she will 'scream until sky draws nigh earth'; the scorned Ishtar threatens Anu in *Gilg.* SBV VI.96–100 that she will smash the gates of the underworld and 'make the dead outnumber the living'; the jilted Ereshkigal, herself confined to the underworld, performs what is in effect a plaint in heaven through her intermediary Namtar, in which she threatens Anu, Enlil, and Ea that she will 'make the dead outnumber the living' (*Nerg.-Eresh.* SBV V.(9')–(12') = (25')–(28')); the spurned Anat in *Aqhat* KTU 1.18.i.6–19 threatens El that she will 'make [your head] run [with blood], / Your old gre[y bea]rd with gore'.²⁵⁶ We are dealing here with a decidedly marked motif (slighted goddess intimidates the sky god with the threat of cosmic violence), whose recurrence throughout Sumerian, Akkadian, and Ugaritic texts is very striking.²⁵⁷ The persistent conjunction in these Mesopotamian, Anatolian, Ugaritic, and Greek narratives of at least two of these three marked motifs (the failed seduction, the plaint in heaven, the threat of cosmic violence to the sky god) raises a central problem and highlights a crucial indeterminacy. On one view, in the transmission of myths from the Near East to Greece 'the recurring characters and motifs were not, as a rule, transmitted as a fully embodied narrative, from which they were somehow shaken loose by the hazards of transmission, but rather... they were transmitted as already somewhat loose clusters of characters, motifs, themes and functions'; 'we are dealing... with the creative redeployment of common, and evolving, clusters of mythical ideas'.²⁵⁸ On another view, we have here the reception in Mesopotamian, Ugaritic, and Greek mythological poetry of an integral narrative sequence of the Babylonian *Gilgamesh* epic with the characteristic → refiguration and → transplantation that we would expect. Such refiguration and transplantation are, on a neoanalytical view, also characteristic of Homer's reception of earlier Greek epic poetry.²⁵⁹ The choice between these two interpretations of the phenomena is very difficult to make without *parti pris*.

The 'plaint in heaven' is found three times in the *Iliad*, performed successively by Aphrodite, Ares, and Artemis (5.337–430, 5.859–906, 21.479–514).

²⁵⁶ *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*: George 1999: 171. *Aqhat*: S. B. Parker 1997: 63 (cf. *Baal* KTU 1.3.v.23–5; S. B. Parker 1997: 117).

²⁵⁷ M. L. West 1997: 180 captures this motif at too vague a level, characterizing it as 'a god or goddess' 'giv[ing] forceful expression to their disagreements' with the chief god. Cf. Louden 2006: 249–51.

²⁵⁸ Csapo 2005: 78, after Mondì 1990. Cf. George 2003: i.57.

²⁵⁹ Kullmann 1991: 426–7 = 1992: 102: 'Vielfach läßt sich in der frühgriechischen Epik beobachten, daß nicht nur Einzelmotive übernommen werden, sondern daß aus demselben Zusammenhang mehrere Motive assoziativ übernommen und unterschiedlichen Gegebenheiten adaptiert werden oder daß zusammenhängende Motivketten in neuem Zusammenhang in den homerischen Gedichten wiederkehren.'

W. Burkert related each of these to the motif as employed at *Gilg.* SBV VI, assuming that the *Gilg.* SBV VI motif was first transferred to Aphrodite in *Iliad* V, and thence subsequently to the other Iliadic passages.²⁶⁰ This approach was criticized by R. Mondi:

Rather than see, as does Burkert, the realization of this theme with Aphrodite [in *Iliad* V] as the original, derived from the Orient, which is 'repeated' and 'slightly varied' in the theomachy..., we might assume that, regardless of its ultimate origin, at the time of the composition of our *Iliad* this scene type was a productive motif in the epic repertoire, realized three times by the poet of our *Iliad* with three different deities [sc. Aphrodite, Ares, Artemis] for three different contextual purposes.²⁶¹

In a similar critique of Burkert, A. Kelly argues that even if certain Iliadic motifs had distantly been derived from the Near East, they have been 'fully assimilated' in the Greek epic tradition before Homer, by whose time the motifs in question are found to function as 'typical' elements.²⁶²

However, to regard the three Iliadic 'plaint in heaven' scenes as type-scenes is problematic. There are, it is true, 'different contextual purposes' to the scenes, but it is just as obvious that the scenes are interrelated; we are brought back once again to weighing differences against similarities.²⁶³ The scenes involving Aphrodite and Ares in *Iliad* V occur within the *aristeia* of Diomedes, the scene involving Artemis in *Iliad* XXI in the context of the *aristeia* of Achilles; and Diomedes, in that part of the poem, is an 'anticipatory doublet' of Achilles.²⁶⁴ More widely, various scenes in *Iliad* XX–XXI mirror scenes of *Iliad* V–VI.²⁶⁵ The duel between Achilles and Aeneias in *Iliad* XX mirrors that between Diomedes and Aeneias in *Iliad* V, with Aeneias rescued by a deity in each case (Aphrodite in *Iliad* V, Poseidon in *Iliad* XX).²⁶⁶ Ares in *Iliad* XXI signals the intratextual link to the scene in *Iliad* V ($\Rightarrow$ *Il.* 21.396–9 ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε κτλ.);²⁶⁷ *Iliad* 21.391–434, where Athene and Hera are ranged

²⁶⁰ Burkert 1992: 97.

²⁶¹ Mondi 1990: 190 n. 7.

²⁶² According to Kelly 2008: 265, the threefold division of the cosmos at *Il.* 15.189–95 derives not from *Atrahasis* OBV I.1.11–16, but is an instance of the 'traditional theme of division or *δασμός*' (cf. Lane Fox 2008: 354–5). The catalogue of Zeus' lovers at *Il.* 14.315–28 derives not from *Gilg.* SBV VI, but exemplifies the 'catalogue form', one of the Greek epic tradition's 'most basic structural imperatives' (Kelly 2008: 290). Hera's cosmic oath at *Il.* 15.36–8 derives not from the Near East, but is 'one of the most well-recognised typical scenes in Homeric poetry' (ibid. 290). The scene of Hera's adornment prior to the seduction of Zeus (*Il.* 14.161–86) derives not from the Sumerian Inanna and Dumuzi tradition, but is 'a typical "seduction" scene' (ibid. 294). Kelly does not discuss the 'plaint in heaven'. Cf. also, on Kelly on Burkert, Haubold 2013a: 31–2.

²⁶³ → Differences versus similarities.

²⁶⁴ See Appendix C.

²⁶⁵ N. J. Richardson 1993: 10–11.

²⁶⁶ *Il.* 20.176–211 ~ 6.121–240; 20.203 ~ 6.145; 20.445 and 447 ~ 5.436 and 438.

²⁶⁷ See § 4.9, p. 140.

against Ares and Aphrodite, appears to be a condensed reprise of the situation in *Iliad* V; and Artemis' plaint in heaven in *Iliad* XXI reprises lines found in Aphrodite's in *Iliad* V (*Il.* 21.509–[510] = 5.373–4).²⁶⁸ Appreciation of these scenes requires that they be seen specifically in relation to one another; in other words, there are strong grounds for regarding this as specific intratextual allusion, not (just) a type-scene.²⁶⁹ Here there is an identifiable 'direction of flow', or 'line of development' of the narrative, from earlier episodes to later.²⁷⁰

In general, we expect a type-scene to offer a template or a bare schema; the schema of a 'plaint in heaven' type-scene would be: (a) deity x is hurt by person y , (b) deity x is upset and betakes him- or herself to heaven, and (c) deity x complains in heaven before his or her father z_1 and mother z_2 . In the *Iliad*, x is Aphrodite, Ares, or Artemis; y is Diomedes (twice) or Hera; z_1 is Zeus (three times) and z_2 is Dione or Leto. The variety of different persons involved affords only superficial support to the assumption of a type-scene. Comparison of *Il.* 5.337–430 with *Gilg.* SBV VI immediately problematizes the assumption, for we see a striking degree of correspondence in specific content, and not just form: x is Aphrodite or Ishtar; z_1 and z_2 are Zeus and Dione or Anu and Antu (the love goddess's father and mother: a personified male and female sky); and y is an outstanding human hero: Gilgamesh or Diomedes. The significance of the identity of the deities has been repeatedly emphasized.²⁷¹ A similar point can be made, more indirectly, about the heroes involved: Diomedes plays out the part of Gilgamesh in this episode of *Iliad* V, but for this part of the *Iliad* Diomedes serves as a 'stand-in' for Achilles, and Achilles in the *Iliad* more widely plays out the part of Gilgamesh.²⁷² Arguably, therefore, we have a $\rightarrow$ two-tier transference: from Gilgamesh to Achilles to Diomedes (a comparable two-tier transference from Antilochos to Patroklos to Phoinix was argued for in § 2.4, pp. 74–5).

It is also hard to see the application of the 'plaint in heaven' motif within the *Iliad* to, precisely, Aphrodite, Ares, and Artemis as merely casual. The three deities are closely related and can be taken to represent different facets of the Near Eastern goddess: love, warfare, hunting. The relationship between Aphrodite and Ares has already been touched on (§ 5.10). There are also strong links between Aphrodite and Artemis, despite some obviously antithetical

²⁶⁸ *Il.* 21.510 is regarded as a concordance interpolation by M. L. West 1998–2000: ii.264; cf. N. J. Richardson 1993: 96.

²⁶⁹ Andersen 1997: 32: 'What we have here is probably not another instance of a typical scene ("god complaining in heaven"), but a repetition with variations of a typically Iliadic scene.'

²⁷⁰ Di Benedetto 1994: 225 'C'è una linea ben precisa che ... porta dall'*aristia* di Diomede nei canti V–VI a quella di Achille nella parte finale del poema.' See Appendix F.

²⁷¹ Burkert 1992: 97; M. L. West 1997: 362; Powell 2011: 561.

²⁷² On Achilles and Diomedes, cf. von Scheliha 1943: 185–7; Kullmann 1984: 314–15 = 1992: 147; Di Benedetto 1994: 225; Burgess 2006a: 157 and n. 22; Louden 2006: 17–30; Mueller 2009: 168–9; R. B. Rutherford 2012b: 21; Tsagalis 2011: 220. On Gilgamesh (plus Enkidu) and Achilles (plus Patroklos), see § 5.19; cf. J. R. Wilson 1986: 28–31; M. L. West 1997: 336–47.

aspects (see, e.g., *Haph* 16–20). Thus we get the same emphatic circumscription of each goddess's power in *Iliad* XXI and *Iliad* V: Artemis, like Aphrodite, is a women's, not a warrior's, goddess (*Il.* 21.481–8; 5.420–30). Artemis as 'mistress of wild animals' has a natural affinity with the Assyrian Ishtar and Ugaritic 'Attartu (Astarte).²⁷³ And, suggestively, it is Artemis' closest Ugaritic counterpart, Anat, who functions as the → 'equivalent' of Ishtar in the Ugaritic refiguration of the *Gilg.* SBV VI 'plaint in heaven' scene in the epic *Aqhat*.²⁷⁴ Thus the application of the 'plaint in heaven' motif to, precisely, Inanna in Sumerian, Ishtar in Akkadian, Shaushka in Hittite, Anat in Ugaritic, and Aphrodite, Ares, and Artemis in Greek does not seem random or fortuitous, as a purely typological explanation would seem to entail. Within the *Iliad* we may think, rather than of a type-scene, first, of an intertextual and cross-cultural 'translation': Ishtar (*Gilg.* SBV VI) = Aphrodite (*Iliad* V); and, subsequently, of two intratextual transferences: Aphrodite (*Iliad* V) > Ares (*Iliad* V) > Artemis (*Iliad* XXI).

5.16 Some Interim Conclusions

M. Mueller once drew attention to the 'contextual surplus' exhibited by many Homeric doublets, as arguing for a 'model-copy relationship', rather than a formulaic origin, between them and as implying the use of fixed (not necessarily written) texts.²⁷⁵ Repeatedly in our discussion we have seen the recurrence of specific details that problematize typological explanation, much in the manner of Mueller's 'contextual surplus'. This is true not just intratextually, of recurrences within a single Homeric poem, nor even intertextually, of recurrences across different early Greek hexameter poems, but also of recurrences across Near Eastern and Greek poems (the Dumuzi–Inanna songs and *Haph*, § 5.8; *Gilg.* SBV and the *Iliad*, §§ 5.10, 5.13–15).

According to the preceding analysis, *Iliad* V will be interacting with a very faithful version of *Gilg.* SBV VI, oral or written, in whatever language and at whatever remove.²⁷⁶ We must reckon once again, therefore, with a high degree

²⁷³ M. L. West 1997: 56; Faulkner 2008: 152–3.

²⁷⁴ Anat as counterpart of Artemis: P. L. Day 1992: 190 n. 63; Walls 1992: 203. Anat and Ishtar: Friedrich 1978: 17–18. Halperin 1983: 191–2 compares Anat–Aqhat with Aphrodite–Daphnis. (Differently, Louden 2006: esp. 245–8 discusses parallels between Anat and *Athene*.)

²⁷⁵ Mueller 1984: 151–2, 158; cf. 2009: 165 on 'name association'. Compare also Di Benedetto 1994: *passim*.

²⁷⁶ M. L. West 1997: 627: 'We need not assume that the Homeric poets "knew" [*Gilg.* SBV] as an Akkadian text, or in an Aramaic version; they may personally have known no language but Greek; yet they cannot have been separated from it at many removes.' Patzek 2011: 400: 'In diesem Fall würde sich die Kenntnis des Iliasdichters eindeutig auf das Schriftwerk beziehen und man könnte ausschließen, dass ihm das Epos nur durch mündliches Hörensagen bekannt gewesen wäre'; cf. 401. Compare and contrast Henkelman 2006: 811: 'It is well possible that

of textual fixity in transmission, in this case even across languages and cultures.²⁷⁷ We may leave the question open whether this (sufficiently) fixed text is to be conceived as written or as oral or as coexisting in written and oral forms. In any event, the *Iliad* will be responding here to poetic features supervenient on any → simple story of the Gilgamesh saga; we are dealing with a form of allusion not reducible to a form of → mythological intertextuality. Near Eastern influences on Greek epic are more commonly conceived in terms of mythology, not poetics.²⁷⁸ But the possibility that a particular narrative of early Greek hexameter poetry may be influenced in this kind of way by a particular narrative of Near Eastern poetry needs also to be entertained.²⁷⁹

It is also important to note that it is possible, indeed necessary, to establish priority between deployments of the motifs: thus the ‘plaint in heaven’ sequence *Gilg.* SBV VI > *Iliad* V > *Iliad* XXI makes excellent sense as a progression, whereas the sequence *Gilg.* SBV VI > *Iliad* XXI > *Iliad* V does not.²⁸⁰ So too does the ‘bathing–adornment–seduction’ sequence *Gilg.* SBV VI > *Hedammu* > *Ullikummi*, as *Gilg.* SBV VI > *Ullikummi* > *Hedammu* does not. In other words, a stemmatic or hierarchical thinking of sorts imposes itself; these are not just ‘floating motifs’.

It is no less important, however, to record that they *could* have become floating motifs. That has arguably happened with the ‘plaint in heaven’ motifs at *Iliad* 9.510–12 (Phoinix’s speech) and *Works and Days* 256–62, where the Litai and Dike respectively, both personified, having suffered outrage or rebuff from men betake themselves to Zeus and recount their mistreatment to procure their wrongdoers’ punishment. To this extent these figures resemble Inanna in *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*, Ishtar in *Gilg.* SBV VI, Anat in *Aqhat*, and Aphrodite in *Iliad* V. Also similar, though less close, is the supplication of Zeus by Thetis, who brings a complaint on behalf of her wronged son and asks for redress (*Iliad* 1.500–10). We might recognize in all three of these a ‘plaint before Zeus’ motif in early Greek hexameter poetry that still conceivably owes its genesis to the Near Eastern motif, but which it would make no interpretative sense to relate to *Gilg.* SBV VI (the connection is both weakly marked and seems to be lacking in meaning). Or to take another

even the occasional match on the level of words, names, imagery or other significant details ... in the *Gilgamesh Epic* and the *Iliad*, has to be explained by oral rather than textual transmission.’

²⁷⁷ We must reckon with variation as well: Dalley 2013: 173.

²⁷⁸ Mythology: Mondy 1990: 145, 146–7; Csapo 2005: 78. Poetics: Patzek 2011, esp. 393–402; Currie 2012a: 572. On the differences of the approaches, cf. Edmunds 1997: 438–9; 2005: 32.

²⁷⁹ Cf. López-Ruiz 2014: 162, 168–71.

²⁸⁰ Contrast Kirk 1990: 99, who would derive *Il.* 5.337–430 from 21.479–514: ‘Trying to identify the “original” of such near-doublets is notoriously hazardous ... One must admit, however, that here the Theomachy text, despite the difficulties of that episode, is the more satisfactory.’ That can surely only seem viable if *Gilg.* SBV V is left out of the picture.

example: the motif of the threat to confound the upper and netherworlds that is found in conjunction with the plaint in heaven in *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*, *Gilg.* SBV VI, *Nerg.-Eresh.* SBV, and *Aqhat* (§ 5.15) appears as an autonomous motif at *Iliad* 20.61–5, where Hades fears that the conflict of the gods might expose the dwellings of the underworld to view.²⁸¹ Again, it would seem to make no interpretative sense to see an allusion here to *Gilg.* SBV VI. We should recognize both that some motifs can become allusively inert through repetition and that others, or the same motifs in certain narrative contexts, can mobilize specific allusions. (Compare Hinds, § 5.13, on the pre-Virgilian and the Ovidian uses of the ‘many mouths’ motif in Latin poetry.) The difficulty, and often subjectivity, in distinguishing the cases does not mean that we should doubt the validity or importance of the distinction both in theory and in practice. Recognizing that (say) the motif of the ‘plaint in heaven’ is allusively inert in some instances does not undermine the recognition that it is allusive in others, nor vice versa. Not every case passes the test of markedness and meaningfulness, and that is just what we should expect.

IV. THE QUESTION OF AWARENESS OF NEAR EASTERN SOURCES

5.17 A Poetics of Partial Assimilation

On a prevalent view, the ancient Greek epic poets, and still less their public, were not interested in any putative poetic debts to the Near East.²⁸² This chapter has held to the contrary view. There is scant evidence, apart from the poetic texts themselves, for either position. The audiences of early Greek epic are inaccessible to us; the appeal to them, moreover, courts methodological problems.²⁸³ All the same, they cannot be left completely out of account, and some general and probabilistic reflections on both poets and audiences follow at

²⁸¹ M. L. West 1997: 391–2. Also found as an autonomous motif in the Akkadian *Ishtar's Descent* 16–20. (The motif is not found in the Sumerian *Inanna's Descent*: cf. 73–7; Black et al. 2004: 67–8.)

²⁸² Haubold 2006: 9; 2013a: 11, 24; cf. Most 1993: 385; Burgess 2006a: 151.

²⁸³ → Fallacy of audience limitation. The Homeric scholia, which are accessible to us, are admittedly uninterested in Near Eastern ‘sources’ of Homer (Budelmann and Haubold 2008: 22; Haubold 2013a: 24). But that is, perhaps, accounted for by their ‘Greek chauvinism’ (J. T. Kakridis 1971: 54–5; cf. Hall 1989: 21, 23–4; Nünlist 2009: 13): it took a ‘barbarian-lover’ (Plut. *de malign. Her.* 857a) like Herodotus to posit Egyptian sources for Homer (2.116.1; cf. Diod. 1.12.10) and even Aeschylus (2.156.6). Moreover, the critical prejudice that ‘oldest is best’ (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.18–92), and the conviction that Homer is oldest and best (Severyns 1928: 99–100; Nünlist 2009: 14; Keaney and Lamberton 1996: 13), militated against the recognition of any sources of Homer.

the end of this chapter (§ 5.19). The present section focuses on the poetic texts and will argue, in the first instance, that there is a possible way of viewing the early Greek hexameter treatment of *people* and *places* on which Near Eastern source material is purposely imperfectly assimilated. The suggestion is that Near Eastern origins are often not disguised, although they might easily have been, in order to draw attention to the appropriation of Near Eastern material.

First, places. Quite generally, the place where a story is set is capable of doing double duty for the story's place of origin; in other words, naming the people among whom the story takes place can be a way of inscribing its provenance in the story itself. Let us take two later examples. The quarrelling trees of Callimachus' Fable of the Laurel and the Olive (*Iambus* 4, fr. 194 Pfeiffer) are situated on Mount Tmolos in Lydia in a transparent reflection of the story's provenance; in this case the narrator explicitly introduces this as a tale which 'the Lydians of old tell' (lines 6–8).²⁸⁴ And Ovid's tale of Philemon and Baucis is set in Phrygia (*Met.* 8.621 *collibus... Phrygiis*), where, scholars infer, the tale itself originates.²⁸⁵ We must ask how close our early Greek hexameter narratives come to this kind of thing. Some critics are happy to impute to the poets and audiences interest in the foreign origin of certain material. It has been argued that the 'Asiatic' setting of our seduction scenes points to an Asiatic (or Anatolian) origin of the motif.²⁸⁶ In locating Typhoeus/Typhaon (henceforth, 'Typhon') 'among the Arimoi' (= Aramaeans?), Homer and Hesiod can be thought to be sourcing the myth for us (*Il.* 2.783, *Hes. Th.* 304).²⁸⁷ The same can be pondered for the setting in early Greek myth of Prometheus' punishment in the Caucasus (first clearly attested in 'Aesch.' *Prom. Ly.* fr. *193 *TGrF*, but possibly already traditional for Hesiod).²⁸⁸ It is worth noting that Hellenic local traditions too, not just Near Eastern ones, could retain the imprint of their provenance: Hesiod's localization of Zeus' birth in Crete indicates a Cretan local tradition, as his localization of the division of meats by

²⁸⁴ Kerkhecker 1999: 86 and n. 15; Burkert 1992: 121. Fables as a whole may represent a good illustration of a Near Eastern genre assimilated into Greek culture without its origins being obscured: note especially Babrius, *Prologue to Book 2*, lines 1–3, for the genre as having a self-confessedly (As)syrian origin (Rollinger 2006, on the equivalence 'Syrian'–'Assyrian'). See Faraone 1999: 37–8. Differently, Haubold 2013a: 25–30, playing down the Greek fable's inscriptions of its Near Eastern provenance.

²⁸⁵ Hollis 1970: 108–11; A. H. F. Griffin 1991: 64.

²⁸⁶ J. Griffin 1992: 201–2: 'in Homer such amours cluster round the hills of Asia Minor... The poet of the *Iliad* derives these figures from an Asiatic story: the loves and deeds of the great goddess of the mountains'; Burkert 1990: 6 = 2007: 143. Bachvarova 2016: 18: 'the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, set on Mt. Ida, shows Near Eastern influence also came via western Anatolia'; cf. 328.

²⁸⁷ Fontenrose 1966: 74–5: 'The scene of the Greek myth is obviously its land of origin.' The equation of 'Arimoi' and Aramaeans will be discussed presently.

²⁸⁸ M. L. West 1966: 313–14; 2014: 20–1.

Prometheus on 'Mekone' signals a Sicyonian tradition (*Th.* 477–84, 536).²⁸⁹ Murkier, and halfway between a Near Eastern and a Hellenic local tradition, is the case of Aphrodite and Cyprus. The provenance of the *Cypria* was declared in the title which it bore from at least the fifth century BC (*Hdt.* 2.117): τὰ Κύπρια ἔπη, 'the epic of Cyprus'.²⁹⁰ Cyprus would also be a plausible place to locate the early receptions of Dumuzi–Inanna songs and *Gilgamesh* into Greek hexameter poetry.²⁹¹ It is a famous oddity that Aphrodite is called 'Cyprian' in *Iliad* V alone; it may not be coincidence that this is the book in which she most particularly recalls Ishtar in *Gilg.* SBV VI.²⁹² Aphrodite's toilette was narrated in the *Cypria* (fr. 4 Bernabé) and it is to Cyprus that Aphrodite repairs to perform her toilette in the other early Greek hexameter narratives of her toilette (*HApH* 58–9, 66; *Odyssey* 8.362–3), narratives which, we have seen, recall the toilette of the Mesopotamian Ishtar–Inanna. The setting of the goddess's toilette in Cyprus could be motivated by Aphrodite's cultic association with the island (as Aigai is the setting of Poseidon's 'arming scene', *Il.* 13.10–38), but that is not necessarily all there is to it.²⁹³ It is tempting to conjecture that Near Eastern mythopoetic traditions concerning Ishtar–Inanna were first received into Greek hexameter poetry on Cyprus and that when taken up into 'Panhellenic' hexameter poetry (*Iliad* V, *Odyssey* VIII, *HApH*) they continued to bear the stamp of their Cyprian origin.²⁹⁴ Or rather, we should probably say that it was only at the point when

²⁸⁹ On *Th.* 477–84, see M. L. West 1966: 290–3; Burkert 1985: 127 and 398 n. 15; Bremmer 2008: 78–9. On *Th.* 536, M. L. West 1966: 318; Bremmer 2008: 33, 90. Cf. Harder 2012: ii.912–13.

²⁹⁰ Burkert 1992: 103–4; 2005: 299; M. L. West 1999: 365 = 2011b: 410, with parallels. Differently, Clay 1989: 156 and n. 12; cf. Janko 1982: 273 n. 163.

²⁹¹ Bachvarova 2016: 17–18, 323; cf. N. J. Richardson 1991: 125; M. L. West 1997: 612–14, 626, 628; Burkert 2013: 419.

²⁹² Andersen 1997: 28: 'That Aphrodite several times in the fifth book, and nowhere else in the poem, is called by the name of Kypris, seems almost to signal the Eastern connection.' Kirk 1990: 94–5; N. J. Richardson 1991: 126; Pirenne-Delforge 1994: 311–12; Cassio 2012, esp. 413, 424.

²⁹³ Aphrodite's toilette was not bound to occur in Paphos because she had a cult and temple there: Hera had a cult in Argos (*Il.* 4.8, 5.908 Ἥρη ... Ἀργεΐη), but it is to a θάλαμος on Olympus that she repairs for her toilette at *Il.* 14.166 (houses of the gods on Olympus: *Il.* 11.75–7, 18.369, *Od.* 8.324, *HHerm* 251; formula Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες). In the Hittite *Hedammu*, Shauska/Ishtar's toilette occurs 'in the bath house' (sc. of heaven?) (Hoffner 1998: no. 17 § 11.2); in *Ullikummi*, it occurs in Nineveh (Hoffner 1998: no. 18 § 35). Ishtar–Inanna bathes and adorns herself on her sacred island Dilmun in a late xiii–bc Babylonian text (Labat 1970: 248) which Penglas 1994: 166 and Faulkner 2008: 19 propose as a possible model for Aphrodite's toilette on her sacred island Cyprus. However, in the Babylonian text Ishtar–Inanna does not repair to a temple or sanctuary, but washes in a mountain spring, and this bathing and adorning sequence is unconnected with any approach to Dumuzi (it is not a Dumuzi–Inanna song, *pace* Faulkner 2008: 19).

²⁹⁴ Cf. Cassio 2012: 423: 'Aphrodite called Κύπρις, her complaint in heaven and the story of Ares and the Aloadae presuppose a poet with remarkable knowledge of stories or poetic compositions strongly influenced by near Eastern myths, probably mediated by Cyprus in the Orientalizing period.' The allusion to 'Aineiadaí' (*Iliad* XX, *HApH*) suggests a local tradition of the Troad (Faulkner 2008: 49–50); this would then have been combined with a Cyprian tradition. On Cyprus and *HApH*, see, variously, Allen, Sikes, and Halliday 1936: 372; Janko 1982: 273 n. 163; M. L. West 2003c: 16; Faulkner 2008: 18–19, 49.

the narratives became ‘Panhellenic’ that it made sense to inscribe their origins in them.²⁹⁵

This phenomenon, however uncertainly attested in our texts, would speak to an interest on the part of the poets and their audiences in the provenance of mythical material, Near Eastern or Hellenic. Crucially, the localizations that betray the narrative’s provenance to the modern scholar will necessarily have done so also to an ancient audience; the non-assimilation of origins, rather than being inadvertent, may be seen as a → signal.

Let us return to Typhon, one of the most obvious Near Eastern imports into early Greek epic mythology and an especially interesting case of non-assimilation within assimilation. His localization ‘among the Arimoi’ (if the nominative is thus correctly reconstructed)²⁹⁶ appears already to be traditional by the time of Homer and Hesiod (*Il.* 2.783 *ἐν Ἀρίμοις*, Hes. *Th.* 304 *ἐν Ἀρίμοισιν*).²⁹⁷ The identity of these ‘Arimoi’ remains obscure, but they may well be Aramaeans, with *Ἀρμιοι* being a Greek transcription of their Assyrian name, *aramū/arumū/arimē*.²⁹⁸ The Aramaeans in general are likely to have been a significant conduit of Near Eastern culture to the Greeks.²⁹⁹ It is unclear where Homer and Hesiod understood these ‘Arimoi’ to be; possibly in Syria/Cilicia.³⁰⁰ In a version of the myth recounted by Pseudo-Apollodorus, Typhon is located on Mt Kasion in Cilicia (*Bibl.* 1.6.3), none other than the Mt Hazzi where his Hittite counterpart Ullikummi is located in the *Song of Ullikummi* (Hoffner

²⁹⁵ M. L. West 2013: 32 [*Cypria*] is ... how it would have been known outside Cyprus rather than within it; cf. 55.

²⁹⁶ Neuter *Ἄριμα* (a place, not a people), derives no support from *Inarime* at Virg. *Aen.* 9.716, etc. (pace Lane Fox 2008: 335–6); see Fontenrose 1966: 73 and n. 17; M. L. West 1966: 250–1; I. Beck 1973: 1276.6–17; Ravaglioli 1985: 932; Hardie 1994: 224; Radt 2002–11: vii.554

²⁹⁷ Traditional: cf. I. Beck 1973: 1276.63–70; Fontenrose 1966: 67–8. With *Il.* 2.783 *φασί* (cf. Hes. *Th.* 306), cf. *Il.* 24.615–16; Scodel 2002: 79. Typhoeus–Typhon in early epic: esp. Mess 1901, inferring an epic account behind Pind. O.4.6–7, P.1.15–28, ‘Aesch.’ *PV* 351–72, Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F54; cf. Debiasi 2004: 104–7; differently, Griffith 1978: 118–19; Di Benedetto 1995: 130–1 n. 3.

²⁹⁸ On *aramū/arumū/arimē*, see Forrer 1932: 131: the weak vowel of the second syllable may be assimilated to the initial vowel (*aramū*) or the final one (*arumū*, *arimē*). Identified with Homer’s *Ἀρμιοι*: Haider 2005: 311; cf. Fontenrose 1966: 64–5; I. Beck 1973: 1275.71–5; Burkert 1987: 37 n. 47 = 2003: 59 n. 47; M. L. West 1997: 301–2 n. 70; Lipiński 2000: 51–2. With *Ἀρμιοι* < *arimē*, compare *Κήτειοι* < *Hatti* (?), *Od.* 11.521 (Hoekstra 1989: 108; Mader 1991: 1413.57–9). Posidon. F281a.26–7 Edelstein-Kidd, tentatively deriving Homer’s *Ἀρμιοι* from *Ἀραμαῖοι* via *Ἀρμαῖοι*, reveals that *Ἀρμιοι* was not a standard Greek designation for Aramaeans; the Greeks preferred in any case not to speak of *Ἀραμαῖοι*, ‘Aramaean’, but of *Σύριοι*, ‘Syrians’: Posidon. F280.20–2 Edelstein-Kidd; cf. Nöldeke 1871: 460–1.

²⁹⁹ Aramaeans and Greeks: Burkert 1992: 32–3; M. L. West 1997: 592–3; George 2003: i.56. On Ahiqar ~ Aesop via Aramaic, see M. L. West 1969: 115; Kurke 2011: 176–85. Aramaeans in general: Bryce 2009: 37–8.

³⁰⁰ Typhos is located in the ‘Cilician cave’ by Pind. *P.1.16*; cf. *P.8.16*; ‘Aesch.’ *PV* 351–2; cf. Callisth. *FGrH* 124 F33 (‘Corycian cave’). See R. L. Fowler 2013: 28–30. The localizations in the ‘Cilician cave’ and ‘among the Arimoi’ need not intend the same location: Haider 2005: 311. Differently, for a localization in ‘the West’, see Debiasi 2008: 95–6; cf. Lane Fox 2008: 335–7. Differently again, for no geographical reality intended by Homer and Hesiod: Vian 1960: 23.

1998: no. 18 § 32).³⁰¹ A. Bernabé has pointed to another such topographically conscious convergence of Greek and Hittite myth: Nonnus includes an aetiological myth that explains the name of the 'Taurus' mountain range in South-West Asia Minor (Cilicia) from the fact of Zeus' passing there in the shape of a bull (*Dionysiaca* 1.408–9), paralleling a Hittite myth with a similar aetiology. Bernabé concludes: 'In cases such as these it is legitimate to suppose that it is a question of local myths recorded on the spot which transcended the superposition of different cultures.'³⁰² Such treatment of places shows the possible resistance of Greek myth to complete naturalization, its capacity to remain rooted to the place of its origin.

Let us pass from places to the treatment of personal names. The name Typhon (*Τυφῶν*) is transparently derived from Semitic *šāpōn*, the mountain identified with Mt Hazzi.³⁰³ In fact, Canaanite-Phoenician *šāpōn* appears to have given rise to Greek *τυφάων*, and Aramaic *qāšju(n)*, 'top / end (of mountain)', 'promontory', to have led to Hittite *hazzi* and Greek *κάσιον*; in this case, then, the 'superposition of different cultures' (Canaanite-Phoenician, Aramaic, Hittite, Greek) reveals itself on a linguistic level.³⁰⁴ In numerous other cases the personal names of early Greek epic are transparently derived from Semitic ones. The name Belos (*Βήλος*), which appears in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (fr. 137 M-W) in genealogical connections with Aigypptos ('Egyptian'), Arabos ('Arab'), and Phoinix ('Phoenician'), is derived transparently from Semitic *ba'al*.³⁰⁵ Adonis (*Ἄδωνις*) is derived no less transparently from Semitic *'adōn*; Adonis is, further, made a son of Phoinix ('Phoenician') by 'Hesiod' ('Hes.' *Cat.* fr. 139) and made a son of Theias, 'king of the Assyrians', by Panyassis (fr. 27 Bernabé).³⁰⁶ Tethys (*Τηθύς*, *Il.* 14.201, 302) appears to have been fashioned after Babylonian *Tiāmat/tāmtu*; Tethys and Tiamat are respectively the spouses of Okeanos and *Apsū*, '(cosmic) underground water', each couple being primeval parents of the gods.³⁰⁷ Iapetos, grandfather of Deukalion, the hero of the Greek flood myth ('Hes.' *Cat.* fr. 2 and 4 M-W), recalls *Yepet/Japheth*, son of Noah, the hero of the Hebrew flood myth.³⁰⁸ In

³⁰¹ Burkert 1979a: 9; 1987: 20; J. Day 1985: 32–3 n. 92; Lane Fox 2008: 264–5; cf. I. Beck 1973: 1277.34–39; Bryce 2002: 227; Bremmer 2008: 319–20 with references in n. 112. On the cultural geography of the Ullikummi myth over time, see further Burkert 1979 = 2003; Lane Fox 2008: 255–318.

³⁰² Bernabé 1995: 14 (translated). Cf. Bremmer 2008: 336, emphasizing also a Phoenician conduit from Hittite to Greek.

³⁰³ Burkert 1987: 21 and 37 n. 50 = 2003: 59–60; M. L. West 1997: 303; cf. 85–6 and n. 80; Haider 2005: 309.

³⁰⁴ On Aramaic *qāšju(n)*, cf. Colpe 1979.

³⁰⁵ Cf. M. L. West 1985: 84, 149–52; 1997: 57, 442, 446; Hirschberger 2004: 308.

³⁰⁶ Cf. Burkert 1979a: 105; M. L. West 1997: 57; Hirschberger 2004: 305–7.

³⁰⁷ Burkert 1992: 93; M. L. West 1997: 147 and 147–8 n. 200, 383. Kelly 2008: 282–4 allows that Tethys may be derived from Tiamat/Tamtu, while questioning whether the derivation must be late (neo-oriental).

³⁰⁸ Scodel 1982: 44 n. 31; Brown 1995–2001: i.82–3; S. P. Morris 1997: 616; M. L. West 1997: 289–90; Becking 1999; Musäus 2004: 65–6; Bremmer 2008: 21, 81, 90. Differently, Beekes 2010:

all these cases obvious similarities in name are reinforced by obvious relationships in genealogy or mythology; these are thus among the most convincing such examples.³⁰⁹ Such arguments, involving personal names and relying on non-Greek (and non-Indo-European) etymologies, are unscientific.³¹⁰ We are entitled to doubt individual cases, yet the overall picture seems secure: there are frequent attempts in nomenclature to stay faithful to Near Eastern originals, a resistance to complete naturalization. W. Burkert pointed to the 'Kling-Klang' of the names.³¹¹ Many of these names, like Egyptian Thon (*Θων*, *Od.* 4.228), are self-evidently non-Greek and some are 'speaking names', declaring their bearer's ethnicity. A key point is again that this must have been as obvious to the early Greeks as it is to the modern scholar. In such cases the audience were given no option but to recognize the foreign origins.

We may distinguish here three modes in which Greek epic could engage with the personages of Near Eastern mythology. The first and least assimilative is transliteration. This is the mode that gives us *Τυφῶν* from *šāpōn*, *Βῆλος* from *ba'al*, etc. Here there is explicit 'foreignization'.³¹² The second mode is translation. This is the mode that produces the pairing of *Ζεὺς* and *Διώνη*, apparently in response to Babylonian *Anu* and *Antu* ('Mr Sky' and 'Mrs Sky'), employing 'authentic' correspondences or 'calquing'.³¹³ The third and most assimilative is 'refiguration'.³¹⁴ Here 'equivalents' rather than 'authentic' correspondences are sought: the Iliadic Achilles, for instance, is constructed as (among other things) an 'equivalent' of Gilgamesh (§ 5.19).³¹⁵ Refiguration

i.574. For the equation of Deukalion and Noah, cf. Philo *de praemiis et poenis* 23. The flood myth / 'Noah Story' as known to the (early) Greeks: Hilhorst 1998: 57–8; Bremmer 2008: 105. Pind. *O.* 9.43 (cf. *Σ* Pind. *O.* 9.64c, 62b) presupposes the flood and probably draws on a Deukalion-narrative from 'Hes.' *Cat.* fr. 234 M-W (Caduff 1986: 100–1, 131; D'Alessio 2005b: 220 and n. 14; differently, S. R. West 1994: 133–4 n. 2; M. L. West 1985: 55–6; 1997: 489).

³⁰⁹ M. L. West 1997: 58 'Similarity of names is not sufficient in itself to establish a connection between a Greek and an oriental deity. It needs to be supported by some correspondence in function.' Other examples: Momos (*Σ* D *Il.* 1.5 = (?) *Cypria* fr. 1 Bernabé) ~ Mummu (*Enuma elish* I.29–54); Burkert 1992: 103; differently, Barker 2008: 61–5. Mopsos/Moxos ~ Mukshas: Hajnal 2011: 249; cf. Bremmer 2008: 141–3; López-Ruiz 2010: 40–2; R. L. Fowler 2013: 548–50; differently, Lane Fox 2008: 224–39. Herakles ~ Erragal/Erakal/Nergal: Burkert 1979a: 82; differently, M. L. West 1997: 471 n. 101; but cf. also Melqart as 'a Phoenician translation of the Sumerian name Nergal' (Dalley 2000: 164).

³¹⁰ See in general Jasanoff and Nussbaum 1996: 189–90, 190–1; Hajnal 2011: esp. 243–4. A preference for Greek etymologies is well illustrated for Frisk 1973–9: i.642, 705, ii.905 (Herakles < *Ἡρα* + *κλέος*, Iapetos < *ἰάπτω*, Typhon < *τύφομαι*).

³¹¹ Burkert 1984: 89 (Burkert 1992: 92 "rhyming" of the names' is a misleading translation).

³¹² Hardwick 2003: 9, for 'foreignization' as 'translating or representing in such a way that difference between the source and reception is emphasized'.

³¹³ 'Authentic' here intends a 'close approximation to the supposed form and meaning of the source' (Hardwick 2003: 9). 'Calque': Burkert 1992: 98.

³¹⁴ 'Refiguration' involves 'selecting and reworking material from a previous or contrasting tradition' (Hardwick 2003: 10).

³¹⁵ See Hardwick 2003: 9, for an 'equivalent' as 'fulfilling an analogous role in source and reception but not necessarily identical in form or content'.

typically involves both *interpretatio* and 'transplantation'.³¹⁶ The underlying Near Eastern personage is least visible in this third mode: their mythology is naturalized. The most ambitious and interesting early Greek hexameter receptions of Near Eastern mythology are precisely of this 'refiguring' kind: a consequence, it would appear, of creative rather than reproductive poets at work.³¹⁷ From the critic's perspective it will often be hard (or impossible) to tell apart refiguring receptions of an integral Near Eastern narrative from casual and haphazard deployments of disembodied motifs shaken loose from their original narrative contexts.³¹⁸

The foreignizing transliteration of names need not be seen as a default option. It can equally be an active decision, a refusal to assimilate to the point of obscuring origins. Early Greek hexameter poetry embraced foreignizing transliteration in some cases as actively as it refused it in others. We have just seen examples of transliteration embraced (*Τυφῶν*, *Βῆλος*, etc.); let us consider some instances of transliteration refused. Although Aelian in the second century AD refers to a *Γίλγαμος*, king of the Babylonians (NA 12.21), that transliteration was strenuously avoided (as far as we know!) by Greek epic poets, despite a keen interest in the figure of Gilgamesh: Gilgamesh mythology was instead refigured and transplanted into the mythology of Greek → 'equivalents': most obviously, Achilles and Odysseus, but also, arguably, Herakles and Perseus.³¹⁹ To take another example: in the magical papyri and *defixiones* of the Imperial period, the name *Ἐρεσχυγάλ* is found.³²⁰ But early Greek epic does not use the name 'Ereshkigal'; instead, the figure and her

³¹⁶ *Interpretatio*: Noegel 2007: 32–6. 'Transplantation': Hardwick 2003: 10: 'tak[ing] a text or image into another context and allow[ing] it to develop'.

³¹⁷ Rollinger 2011: 221: 'in keinem der Beispiele [liegt] eine Übernahme im Sinne vor einer "Kopie" [vor]. Vielmehr wurden die dem Dichter bekannten altorientalischen Textbausteine jeweils adaptiert und verändert, womit wiederum etwas Neues entstand.' Creative and reproductive poets: see § 2.4, pp. 76–7.

³¹⁸ Rollinger 2011: 219: 'Entscheidend ... ist, dass Texte nicht einfach "übernommen" werden. Vielmehr ist mit vielfältigen Transformationsprozessen zu rechnen, wo tatsächlich ständig "neue" Texte produziert und in jeweils neue Kontexte eingebettet werden. Dieser Umstand erschwert natürlich die Bemühungen der modernen Forschung beträchtlich, solche Vorgänge aufzuspüren und nachzuzeichnen.' Cf. Csapo 2005: 78, cited in § 5.15, p. 195.

³¹⁹ Ael. NA 12.21: Henkelman 2006: 816–49. Aelian's *Γίλγαμος* as 'Gilgamesh': George 2003: i.61; Sallaberger 2008: 122; sceptically, Tigay 1982: 253 n. 9. Gilgamesh mythology attached in early Greek epic to Achilles and Odysseus: M. L. West 1997: 336–47 and 402–17. To Herakles: Burkert 1979: 80, 94; M. L. West 1997: 463–4, 466–7; cf. 2014: 32; Graves 1955: ii.88–9 (for Herakles in early epic, see Sbardella 1994; Danek 1998a: 247; M. L. West 2011a: 30–1). To Perseus: Burkert 1987: 26–8 = 2003: 65–8; 1992: 86; M. L. West 1997: 453–5; Guflier 2002; Henkelman 2006: 812–13 (for Perseus in early epic, cf. *Il.* 14.319–20; Hes. *Th.* 280; Ps.-Hes. Sc. 216–37).

³²⁰ PGM v.340; PGM iv.338 *Κούρη Περσεφόνη Ἐρεσχυγάλ*; cf. PGM lxx *Ἐκάτης Ἐρεσχυγάλ*. Burkert 1992: 68 and 192 n. 30. Near Eastern influence on Greek magic: Graf 1997: 169–74; Faraone 1999: 36–7.

mythology are refigured and transplanted in the mythology of Persephone.³²¹ A last example: Berossus in the third century BC renders, in foreignizing fashion, 'Dumuzi the shepherd' as Δάωνον ποιμένα (BNJ/FGrH 680 F3b); again, that name is avoided in archaic (and classical and Hellenistic) poetry, but Dumuzi's mythology is variously refigured and transplanted, being attached to Anchises, Paris, Adonis, Hippolytos, and Daphnis.³²² The early Greek epic poets, therefore, did and did not employ transliterations. Their transliterations, translations, and refigurations may be instructively compared and contrasted with the later prose accounts of Eudemus, Berossus, and Philo, where in general a much more thoroughgoing transliteration of Near Eastern names can be seen.³²³

The foreignizing transliteration of names reveals, I suggest, a willingness not merely not to obscure, but to point to foreign origins; yet it should not be concluded that the more naturalizing refigurations necessarily reveal any lack of such willingness. It is possible to see early Greek hexameter poetry as pointedly interacting with Near Eastern 'sources' also in cases of refiguration where, simply put, it is critically rewarding (i.e. → meaningful) to see the Greek text as alluding to a Near Eastern 'source-text'. That has been argued in this chapter with respect to early Greek hexameter refigurations of the Sumerian Dumuzi-Inanna poetry and the Standard Babylonian *Gilgamesh* tablet VI (§§ 5.8 and 5.11). Foreignizing transliterations are a direct and explicit indicator of a concern in early Greek hexameter texts to orient an audience towards Near Eastern prototypes, but they may be seen as a point on a sliding

³²¹ Burkert 1979: 109–10 (on Panyassis fr. 27 Bernabé); M. L. West 1997: 159 compares Nergal–Ereshkigal with Hades–Persephone. The myths of Hades–Persephone and Nergal–Ereshkigal each offer an *aition* for the marriage between the lord and lady of the underworld, employ a mixture of romance, violence, and guile, and use the motif of (not) eating the food of the underworld.

³²² For the links of Anchises and Paris with Dumuzi, see §§ 5.5, 5.6. On Daphnis, Hippolytos, and Adonis, see Halperin 1983: *passim* and Crane 1987: 181–4.

³²³ Eudemus (iv BC) fr. 150 Wehrli, paraphrasing *Enuma elish*, employs the transliterations Ταυθέ = Tiamat; Apsu = Ἀπασών; Μωῦμύν = Mummu; <Λ>αχὴν καὶ <Λ>αχόν = Lahmu and Lahamu (for this correction of Δαχὴν καὶ Δαχόν, see Westerink and Comès 1991: 235; the problem of corruption in general: De Breucker 2011: 644); Κισσαρή καὶ Ἀσσωρόν = Kishar and Anshar; Ἀνόν = Anu; Ἐλλινον = Enlil (Ellil); Ἄόν = Ea; Δαύκη = Damkina; Βῆλος = Baal (i.e. Marduk). Cf. Burkert 1992: 93; Frahm 2011: 363–4. Berossus' *Babyloniaka* (iv–iii BC) drawing inter alia on the material covered by *Enuma elish* and *Atrahasis*, employs the transliteration Εἰσουθρος = Zi(u)sudra (BNJ/FGrH 680 F4: the Sumerian name for Akkadian Atrahasis/Utnapishtim: George 2003: i.154 n. 90). The other antediluvian kings are similarly transliterated (ibid.). Yet sometimes, especially with theonyms, Berossus translated rather than transliterated (Breucker 2011: 649): Ea is Κρόνος and Tiamat is Θάλασσα, 'Sea' (BNJ/FGrH 680 F4a–b; contrast Homer's transliteration: Tiamat = Τηθύς). Haubold 2013b: 36 contrasts Berossus' tendency to translate with Eudemus' to transliterate. Philo of Byblos (AD i–ii), presenting the Phoenician succession myth of 'Sanchuniathon' (FGrH 790 F2 §§ 15–41; Attridge and Oden 1981; Baumgarten 1981), generally translates theonyms (M. L. West 1997: 284), but we also get transliterations glossed by translations: Ἡλον τὸν καὶ Κρόνον (El = Kronos, § 16), Ζεὺς Δημιοῦς καὶ Ἄδωδος (Zeus = Baal Adad, § 31).

scale on which we also find refigurations. The foreignizing transliterations have a heuristic value in our argument for helping to situate refigurations on that same continuum.

5.18 What's at Stake?

The preceding discussion of places and persons is not probative, and cannot do more than illustrate the availability of a point of view on which early Greek epic can be deemed to be actively alert to the foreign origins of some of its material. In the absence of strictly probative arguments, one way or the other, let us remind ourselves what is at stake for our approach to early Greek epic.³²⁴ It has been argued throughout this book that 'sources' are often still to be glimpsed in early Greek hexameter poetry not because of some inertia, a more or less negligent failure properly to assimilate, but because the early Greek hexameter poets could be vitally interested in the adaptation of the old (or foreign) to the new (or native), and that they were often interested in signalling rather than effacing their 'sources'. In connection with putative Near Eastern sources, an instructive early Greek hexameter narrative to consider is the Succession Myth of Hesiod's *Theogony*. Perhaps nowhere else in early Greek hexameter poetry is the borrowing of a Near Eastern myth so clear.³²⁵ But whether we are 'meant' to notice the borrowing is less clear. D. Feeney put the problem into focus:

The self-consciousness about the foreign origin of [the Romans'] myths is in marked contrast with the attitudes of pre-Hellenistic Greeks themselves, who did not maintain an awareness that their cosmogonic myths, for example, had come from somewhere else ... It is entirely possible, for example, that the first audience of Hesiod's *Theogony* were very much aware that they had never heard many of these stories before; it is even possible that Hesiod is playing upon such self-consciousness at the beginning of *Works and Days* ... Nonetheless, the important point is that this original awareness—if it existed—did not become part of the poem or its reception. Ready as they were in many contexts and periods to speak of how they took over writing, astrology or divinities from other cultures, the Greeks tended towards the assimilative end of the pole, in comparison with the Romans.³²⁶

I propose to approach the problem through a single episode of Hesiod's Succession Myth: the narrative of Aphrodite's birth from the seaborne genitals

³²⁴ Compare Osborne 1993: 233 for the question 'what is at stake?'.
³²⁵ M. L. West 1966: 19–31; 1997: 276–86; Csapo 2005: 67–79; Woodard 2007: 92–8; I. C. Rutherford 2009: 9–14; López-Ruiz 2010: 84–129; cautiously, Metcalf 2015: 175–90. Differently, Nagy 1982: 72.

³²⁶ Feeney 1998: 65. Cf. Osborne 1996: 142; Lane Fox 2008: 368.

of the castrated Ouranos (*Th.* 176–206). In the Hittite text (of xiv BC) which shows the most remarkable parallels with Hesiod's narrative and which we may take to adumbrate Hesiod's more temporally and geographically proximate Near Eastern source(s), deities are born from the semen of the genitals of the castrated sky god (*Kingship in Heaven [Song of Birth]*: Hoffner 1998: 42–3 no. 14 §§ 5–6).³²⁷ By considering how Hesiod's refiguration exploits the inherited language of early Greek hexameter poetry, I will suggest that Hesiod's reception does indeed assimilate, but in such a way that we can and should infer a self-consciousness about the foreign origin of the material in question.

A traditional epithet of Aphrodite was *φιλομμειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη*.³²⁸ Hesiod acknowledges its traditionality in saying that it is one of several things that 'they [i.e. poets!] call her' (197 *κυκλήσκουσι*). The epithet evidently meant, and was understood by early Greek hexameter poets to mean, 'lover of smiles'.³²⁹ In Hesiod's narrative the epithet is reinterpreted as 'fond of genitals': '[they call her] *philommeides* because she emerged from genitals' (200 *ἥδ' ἐφίλομμειδέα, ὅτι μηδέων ἐξεφαάνθη*). But Hesiod signals his departure from the traditional use by acknowledging, five lines on, Aphrodite's province as 'discourse, deception, and smiles (*μειδήματα*)' (205). Another traditional epithet (certainly for goddesses generally, if not for Aphrodite in particular) is *αἰδοίη*, 'venerable'.³³⁰ It is used of Aphrodite at the start of Aphrodite's second, shorter Homeric hymn: 'I shall sing of venerable...beautiful Aphrodite' (*HHom* 6.1–2 *αἰδοίην...καλὴν Ἀφροδίτην / ᾄσομαι*).³³¹ Hesiod employs the epithet, likewise in conjunction with *καλή*, in the context of Aphrodite's emergence from the genitals of the castrated Ouranos: 'out stepped a venerable beautiful goddess' (194 *ἐκ δ' ἔβη αἰδοίη καλὴ θεός*). In this context it seems impossible to suppress the suggestion that *αἰδοίη* is derived from *αἰδοῖα*, as if the epithet meant, or was peculiarly appropriate to, 'her of the genitalia'.³³²

³²⁷ Cf. I. C. Rutherford 2009: 12, point vii; López-Ruiz 2010: 92. On the mediation of the myth, cf. Lane Fox 2008: 279; López-Ruiz 2010: 84–129; Bachvarova 2016: 23.

³²⁸ *Il.* x 5, *Od.* x 1, Hes. *Th.* 989, *Cat. fr.* 176.1 M-W, *HAph* x 5, *Cypria fr.* 5.1 Bernabé.

³²⁹ Cf. *HHom* 10.3 *αἰεὶ μειδιάει*; *Sapph. fr.* 1.14 Voigt (cf. Rissman 1983: 2). Faulkner 2008: 92; N. J. Richardson 2010: 226. Differently, Heubeck 1965; Càssola 1974: 546; Burkert 1985: 154–5.

³³⁰ M. L. West 1966: 223.

³³¹ *HHom* 6.1 depends on Hes. *Th.* 194, according to Olson 2012: 280.

³³² Σ Hes. *Th.* 194 is sensitive to the suggestion; M. L. West 1966: 223 is not. The real derivation is, of course, *αἰδοῖα* (cf. Latin *pudenda*) < *αἰδοῖος* < *αἰδώς*. Hesiod uses *αἰδοῖα* for genitals at *WD* 733 (contrast *Th.* 180, 188, 200: *μήδεα*); cf. *Il.* 13.568; *Tyrt.* 10.25 *IEG*; *OF* 8F Bernabé (P. Derv. xiii.4) *αἰδοῖον κατέπινεν, ὃς αἰθέρα ἔκθορε πρῶτος*, 'he [sc. Zeus] swallowed the penis of him who first ejaculated the ether [sc. Ouranos]' (so Burkert 2004: 90–3; Janko 2001: 24; differently, M. L. West 1983: 85; R. T. C. Parker 1995: 490; Laks and Most 1997: 15). The last is another early Greek hexameter version of the succession myth, where also *αἰδοῖον* (neuter, 'penis') may pun on *αἰδοῖον* (masculine accusative, 'venerable'): Calame 1997: 67–8; differently, Kouremenos, Parássoglou, and Tsantsanoglou 2006: 27 and n. 69. An oblique case pronominal antecedent *τούτου* (masculine, possessive genitive) is understood with ὅς: cf. *Il.* 7.401; Hes. *WD* 388; *Soph. El.* 1123, *Ant.* 35–6, 479; *Eur. Ion* 560.

A third traditional phrase to be reapplied within the same narrative is the formula for an unsuccessful spear cast that is found in the *Iliad* in the form βέλος ὡκὺ ἐτώσιον ἔκφυγε χειρός, 'the swift missile fled in vain from his hand' (*Il.* 14.407 ~ 22.292).³³³ Hesiod adapts the formula to convey the flight of Ouranos' severed genitals, cast by Kronos behind him: τὰ μὲν οὐ τι ἐτώσια ἔκφυγε χειρός, 'they [*sc.* the genitals] fled by no means in vain from his hand' (*Th.* 182). Here as elsewhere hiatus (ἐτώσια ἔκφυγε) reveals adaptation of a traditional formula.

These Hesiodic usages should be seen as playful or punning.³³⁴ For the effect to work we need a sense both of the traditional use of the phrases and of how they are pressed into untraditional service; the point depends on consciousness of the interplay of traditional early Greek hexameter idiom with untraditional subject matter. If we deny Hesiod and his audience awareness of the distinctness of the two elements (the traditional versus the untraditional, the familiar versus the unfamiliar, and, plausibly, the native versus the foreign), then the reading fails. The assimilation here, then, has been very carefully handled; it is not the case that 'the foreign elements have been completely absorbed'.³³⁵ It is true that the untraditional subject matter here is not explicitly marked as foreign or specifically Near Eastern; but we know the subject matter to be of Near Eastern provenance, and it is not a big leap to infer that, if Hesiod's audience was conscious of this material as being untraditional, unfamiliar, and non-native (as it must be for the effect to work), then it was conscious of it being foreign, that is, Near Eastern. Hesiod in this passage appears to be playing traditional early Greek hexameter expressions off against something untraditional, and if that something untraditional is not Near Eastern myth, it is difficult to see what it is.

We may compare Hesiod's punning use of the epithets φιλομμειδής and αἰδοίη in the context of the castration-and-birth narrative to Homer's punning use of the epithet πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς in the context of a reworking of the folktale motif 'my name is Myself'.³³⁶ The folktale motif relies on the simple ambiguity of using 'Myself'/'myself' ('No one'/'no one') as a proper noun or as a pronoun. Typically for a folktale motif, it is culturally and linguistically unspecific. Homer's version, by contrast, self-consciously exploits resources unique to Greek hexameter poetry.³³⁷ The name Οὐτίς could be easily mistaken for the pronoun οὐ τίς, but for its accent and inflection—which is, of course, the reason why Odysseus (in an only seeming pleonasm) inflects it for Polyphemos: Οὐτίς

³³³ Cf. (οὐχ) ἄλιον βέλος ἔκφυγε χειρός | : *Il.* 5.18, 11.376, 16.480.

³³⁴ G. P. Edwards 1971: 105, on φιλομμειδής; differently, Rowe 1978: 64. Other humorous reapplications of traditional epithets by Hesiod: G. P. Edwards 1971: 80; Scodel 2012: 502–5.

³³⁵ Quotation from M. L. West 1966: 28.

³³⁶ 'Myself' tale: Thompson 1955–8: K602; cf. AT1700; Glenn 1971: 162–3; Hansen 2002: 295–6.

³³⁷ Peradotto 1990: 147–9.

ἐμοί γ' ὄνομα· Οὐτιν δέ με κικλήσκουσι (Od. 9.366). Subsequently, μή τις (405–6, 410) puns on μῆτις: 'my name tricked him and my excellent scheme (μῆτις)' (414; compare 20.19–20). οὗ τις and Οὐτις (accusative Οὐτιν) correspond in accentuation and inflection to μή τις and μῆτις (accusative μῆτιν) respectively.³³⁸ 'My name and scheme' (414) hints at Odysseus' name in early Greek hexameter tradition: πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς. Further, the Kyklopes' question and Polyphemos' answer at 407–8 take a traditional question-and-answer form in Greek epic poetry ('Is it *x* or *y*?' 'No, it is not *x* or *y*') and pun on the ambiguity of οὐδέ: the Kyklopes understand (according to the traditional form), '[No.] it's not the case that someone (οὗ τις) is killing me by guile *or* (οὐδέ) force,' whereas Polyphemos had meant, '[Yes], Outis is killing me, by guile *and not* (οὐδέ) by force.'³³⁹ This intrinsically implausible linguistic misunderstanding (how could Odysseus ever know that the Kyklopes would ask the question in precisely this form?) is thoroughly in the manner of folktale, and as thoroughly *not* in the manner of epic, or not of Homeric epic, at least.³⁴⁰ Homer's version reaches new heights of ingenuity, elaboration, and linguistic specificity, not just of the Greek language, but of that highly specialized subset of it, the language of early Greek *epos*.³⁴¹ This appears to be a self-conscious tour de force, a demonstration of how a simple folktale can undergo transformation and sublimation in early Greek epic.³⁴²

The investigation of Greek epic's relationship to Near Eastern material and of its relationship to folkloric material are related enterprises, and each related to neoanalysis.³⁴³ According to the preceding analyses, we should see a keenly felt distinction between traditional Greek hexameter material and material of a provenance capable of being felt alien to the early Greek hexameter tradition, whether Near Eastern or folkloric. We elide an important dimension of meaning if we suppose that the Near Eastern or folkloric material was regarded as 'traditional' in just the same way as the rest of the poetic inheritance—if either the Near Eastern or folkloric material is seen as 'fully assimilated'. Arguably, an awareness remained of this type of material as special and

³³⁸ Schein 1970: 79–81; Austin 1972: 13 and n. 20.

³³⁹ The question-and-answer form: Macleod 1982: 41 and n. 4; Janko 1992: 316.

³⁴⁰ Straining of credibility in the Polyphemos episode: Peradotto 1990: 46; Scodel 1999: 136–9. In folktale: Goldberg 1997: 359: 'Puns and verbal misunderstandings are common sources of folktale humor.' From Grimm's *Märchen: Clever Hans* (no. 32): 'freundliche Augen zuwerfen' ('to cast sheep's eyes at someone': metaphorically, not literally); *Das tapfere Schneiderlein* (no. 20): 'Siebene auf einen Streich' ('seven at a blow': flies, not men); *The Boy Who Left Home to Find out about the Shivers* (no. 4): 'es gruselt mir' ('it gives me the shivers': from cold, not fear).

³⁴¹ On the punning in the passage, see Peradotto 1990: 147–9.

³⁴² M. L. West 1988: 172 = 2011b: 72: 'the epicization of what had been cult myths or folktales'; 'Legends of heroes overcoming monsters were dressed up in hexameters'; cf. S. R. West 2012a: 135; cf. Hölscher 1978: 52–3. Homer's 'Hellenization' of folktale: P. V. Jones 1997: 29–34, esp. 33. Homer makes the folktale resonate with the poem as a whole: Schein 1970.

³⁴³ Burgess 2001: 62; cf. Saïd 2011: 30–1.

somehow 'alien'.³⁴⁴ The word 'alien' is obviously problematic here, given that Near Eastern, like folkloric, material had been part of Greek epic since time immemorial.³⁴⁵ Yet the poet appears still to have had an ability to separate the two strands, for all their intertwining. Rather than simply assimilating and transforming the folktale, the poet asks his narrative to be compared and contrasted with the folktale.³⁴⁶ Relevant is the careful handling of folktale also on a formal level in the narrative, especially the tendency to put it in character-text.³⁴⁷ Indeed, throughout the *Odyssey* there are signs of a self-conscious negotiation of 'folkloric' and 'epic' elements: there is a playful tension between Odysseus as armed warrior of epic and unarmed folktale hero, and between Odysseus as epic commander of a flotilla of ships (compare *Iliad* 2.631–7) and folktale voyager on a single ship, after the fashion of Sindbad or Iason.³⁴⁸

The foregoing argues for consciousness of material which lies 'inside' the early Greek hexameter tradition and of material which lies 'outside' it, and a self-consciousness about using such material. Accordingly we may recognize an attempt to naturalize, but also not to efface the process of naturalization. W. Burkert described another early Greek hexameter reception of a Near Eastern motif (the casting of lots by three gods at *Iliad* 15.187–93, after *Atrahasis* OBV I.11–16) as 'not so much a translation as a resetting through which the foreign framework still shows'.³⁴⁹ We may add: the continued visibility of the foreign framework need not be inadvertent; the foreign setting may often be meant to show through.³⁵⁰ The view that awareness of Near

³⁴⁴ Penglase 1994: 239.

³⁴⁵ Folktale elements in Greek epic: Davies 2010. Eris at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis ~ 'Uninvited Guest at Wedding' (Davies 1989: 36); Judgment of Paris ~ 'Hero's Choice of Life' (cf. Reinhardt 1960 [1938]: 16–17, 29 = 1997: 171, 184; Louden 2006: 263–6); Odysseus' homecoming ~ 'Homecoming Husband' (Hansen 2002: 201–11; Edmunds 2005: 35). Folktale elements in *Gilg.*: Edmunds 2005: 33–4. The snake and the plant of rejuvenation in *Gilg.* SBV XI corresponds to folktale motifs A1335.5, D1346.5, and H1333.2.1 in Thompson 1955–8.

³⁴⁶ Edmunds 2005: 37: 'the continued existence of the folktale is assumed by the epic poet and subtends its adaptation in epic poetry. In particular, the epic poet assumes his audience's knowledge of his adaptation as a new variant.' Ibid. 39: 'The folktale or folktales would have persisted in the larger oral culture in which the oral epic tradition developed and of which Homer's epic was the culmination. Part of the experience of Homer's audience was, then, the difference between the folktale(s) and Homer's adaptation.' Differently, Danek 1998a: 172, arguing that the audience would not compare the *Odyssey* with the folktale, but with earlier epics on Odysseus' homecoming. The existence of folktale in antiquity: Renger 2006: esp. 145–9.

³⁴⁷ Saïd 2011: 30–1.

³⁴⁸ See esp. Reinhardt 1960 (1948): 48, 53–8; J. Griffin 1980b: 56–8; 1987a: 71–4. Folkloric background of Iason and the Argonauts: G. Anderson 2000: 72–82; Hansen 2002: 151–7. *Odyssey* and Sindbad: Hölscher 1988: 112–15.

³⁴⁹ Burkert 1992: 91. ⇒ *Il.* 15.187–93.

³⁵⁰ Compare the way the older neoanalytical view of a 'semi-rigid taking over' of motifs (Kullmann 1981: 22–3 = 1992: 82; 1991: 426 = 1992: 101; cf. J. T. Kakridis 1949: 8–10) has been reconceptualized in more recent neoanalytically influenced scholarship as a deliberate strategy of allusion (e.g. Danek 1998a: 11–12). → Neoanalysis and allusion.

Eastern origins ‘did not become part of the poem or its reception’ is here called into question with early Greek hexameter poetry.³⁵¹ There is, again, no question of disproving it: the aim of this section has simply been to show that such a view is not inevitable, and that it rules out some valid and interesting ways of interpreting the poetry; that is what is at stake.

V. CONSEQUENCES FOR GREEK AND NEAR EASTERN POETRY

5.19 Neoanalysis and Near Eastern Influences on Early Greek Epic

Early Greek epic shares with Near Eastern poetry not simply isolated motifs, complex narrative structures, and various features of style, form, and outlook.³⁵² It apparently shares with it a whole ‘allusive art’, a wealth of techniques of allusion.³⁵³ The techniques in question include: quotation (verbatim and non-verbatim); allusive motif transference from one character or mythological context to another; opposition in imitation; conflation of sources (*contaminatio*, ‘multiple reference’); the use of mythological exempla with ad hoc invention; signalling of the source; and scenes with simultaneous intratextual and intertextual allusion.

Our tolerance of ‘coincidences’ is here put severely to the test, and the significance of these correspondences between Greek and Near Eastern epic may be gauged by considering two controls. First, from Germanic epic: *Beowulf* reflects on and positions itself relative to its tradition in similar ways to the Homeric epics. A little under halfway through *Beowulf*, a court poet (*scop*) of the Danes regales banqueters in Hrothgar’s hall with a song about the slaughter once enacted in the hall of the Frisian king Finn (1068–1159a). This song within a song evidently engages with existing poetic tradition, of which the fragmentary *The Battle of Finnesburh* appears to offer us a glimpse.³⁵⁴ But *Beowulf*’s song within a song offers an apparently unconventional and unsettling view of the tradition by adopting the idiosyncratically

³⁵¹ Quotation: Feeney 1998: 65. Cf. 1991: 13: ‘Already Homer altered stories he inherited, but he did not call the audience to take stock of the fact of alteration.’ Haubold 2013a: 53: ‘the point, for [Hesiod], was not to borrow some exotic story from somewhere.’

³⁵² See, in this vein, Burkert 1992: 114–20; M. L. West 1997: 168–219. Shared framework: Haubold 2013a: 51–2. Cf. Bachvarova 2016: 41–6 (on Greek and Hurro-Hittite epic). A more sceptical approach is Metcalf 2015.

³⁵³ Compare Reichel 1992: 189; 1994: 345–6.

³⁵⁴ For the fragment, see, e.g., Mitchell and Robinson 1998: 212–15; cf. O’Donoghue 1999: xxii–xxiv.

pathetic perspective of a female victim, Finn's widow Hildeburh (1071–1080a, 1157–1159a).³⁵⁵ Compare with this what we find in Homer: in *Odyssey* VIII, a court poet, Demodokos, in his third song regales banqueters in Alkinoos' palace with a song on the sack of Troy (*Od.* 8.499–520). This song within a song also engages with existing poetic tradition, evidenced by the fragmentary *Little Iliad* and, especially, the *Sack of Troy (Iliou Persis)*.³⁵⁶ It also offers an unconventional and unsettling view of the tradition by encouraging the listener (through the simile in the primary narrative that immediately follows Demodokos' embedded narrative, 523–31) to adopt the pathetic perspective of a female victim, an anonymous Trojan widow, who is both like and unlike the Iliadic Andromache.³⁵⁷ Here we have an arresting coincidence in the way *Beowulf* and the *Odyssey* figure their relationship to their tradition.³⁵⁸ It is not the only such coincidence: at *Beowulf* 867–97 a poetically well-versed (867–74) thane of Hrothgar tells an inset story of Sigemund's dragon fight that serves as a mirror or 'para-narrative' of *Beowulf*'s story. This strikingly parallels the way at *Iliad* 9.524–99 the poetically well-versed (524–8) Phoenix tells an inset story of Meleagros' anger and withdrawal that serves as a mirror of Achilles'.³⁵⁹

Our second control is furnished by Bosnian heroic song: Demodokos' third song, again, and its effect on Odysseus, may be compared with a scene in Avdo Mededović's *Marriage of Vlahinjić Alija*, verses 2911–25, where the hero Alija, on hearing Ruža sing of the abduction of his bride Zlata, wishes to weep but cannot, for fear of compromising his disguise.³⁶⁰ What Ruža sings of is in fact the central event of the main story, so we have here a *mise en abyme* that approaches an Odyssean self-consciousness. According to G. Danek, 'The scene has its exact parallel in the eighth book of Homer's *Odyssey*... The two scenes derive, independently of one another, from two poets who reflect on the essence of poetry.'³⁶¹ We also find at verses 106–250 of the *Marriage of Vlahinjić Alija* another 'song within a song' containing mythological paradigms for the main story, thus paralleling what we are familiar with in Homer, and have just observed for *Beowulf*.³⁶²

These controls illustrate how striking parallels in allusive and self-reflexive poetic techniques may come about through, apparently, polygenesis (assuming

³⁵⁵ Bowra 1952: 455–60, on the contrasts between *Beowulf* and the *Finnesburh* fragment.

³⁵⁶ Hainsworth 1984: 116–17, 131; Danek 1998a: 158–9; M. L. West 2003a: 16; 2012: 230–1; Scafoglio 2004b: 293 and n. 17.

³⁵⁷ R. B. Rutherford 1986: 155 = 2009: 174; Segal 1994: 121–3; D. L. Cairns 2009: 43–4; Halliwell 2011: 88–9; Rinon 2006: 220–1.

³⁵⁸ In both poems, the traditional course of events is determined by → fate (*Beowulf* 1074, 1077; *Od.* 8.510–11).

³⁵⁹ Cf. Reichel 1994: 349. 'Para-narrative': Alden 2000.

³⁶⁰ Danek 2002a: 137–8.

³⁶¹ Danek 2002a: 41 (translated). On Odysseus' tears here (⇒ *Od.* 8.521–31), cf. Halliwell 2011: 38.

³⁶² Danek 2002a: 47 n. 28.

we can reject the explanations of a common Indo-European inheritance or indirect Homeric influence on *Beowulf* and/or Međedović as unlikely to lead to these kinds of similarities).³⁶³ We are dealing here with sophisticated, highly developed traditional epics, each of which has been described as 'encyclopedic' in its approach to its tradition.³⁶⁴ We should allow that epic poems such as these are able to develop such striking techniques independently of each other. Certainly there can be no presumption that self-conscious and allusive poetic techniques are the distinctive property of any one culture or poetic tradition.

The polygenetic explanation is also possible with the allusive techniques found to be shared between Near Eastern mythological poetry and early Greek epic, and it would have agreeable implications for the arguments of this chapter: if such techniques of allusion are to be seen as generally capable of arising in sophisticated, developed poetic traditions, then their presence in Homer is entirely plausible. The techniques will not simply be 'Virgilian' (or 'Ovidian' or 'Alexandrian'), nor will it be 'anachronistic' to find them in the *Iliad*, if we find them already in *Gilg. SBV* (and other Mesopotamian poetry).³⁶⁵ We might also wish to infer that the techniques are common to both oral-derived and literary poetic traditions.

However, the polygenetic model seems much less adequate to explain the parallels in allusive techniques between Greek and ancient Near Eastern epic than between Greek and Old English or South Slavic epic.³⁶⁶ In the first place, historical connections and cultural influence are abundantly attested between archaic Greece and the ancient Near East; they impress for their abundance here as much as they do for their absence there.³⁶⁷ Second, the quality and quantity of the parallels in our list of shared allusive techniques go well beyond what we can see with our Germanic and South Slavic controls. Third, the case for the transference of certain specific motifs from Near Eastern poetry to Greek epic is about as strong as could reasonably be expected (I consider the prime exhibit to be the 'plaint in heaven' of Ishtar and Aphrodite at, respectively,

³⁶³ Polygenesis, in general: Allison 1997. Shared Indo-European inheritance, in general: Katičić 1998: 7–8; Matasović 1996; M. L. West 2007: 17–18, 19. Influence, in general: Reichel 1994: 341, 350 n. 27 (medieval epics influenced by Homer via Latin epic); Stanley 1987: 286–7; Clarke 2006; Danek 1996: 17–19 with nn. 25–30 (a Serbo-Croatian 'Homecoming Husband' song probably influenced by the *Odyssey*).

³⁶⁴ *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: Mueller 2009: 174; cf. R. L. Fowler 2004: 228. *Gilg. SBV*: Tigay 1982: 247; cf. George 2007: 52. *Beowulf*: Mitchell and Robinson 1998: 21. Encyclopedic reference in Međedović: Čolaković 2006: 168–70, esp. 168. The 'omnibus genre' as 'characteristic of epic across cultures': J. M. Foley 2004: 181–2.

³⁶⁵ Cf. Burgess 2009: 80, cited in § 2.3, p. 70.

³⁶⁶ Compare also the 'typological' explanation of Greek–Mesopotamian parallels preferred by Nagy 1990 (1982): 81; 1982: 72; 2005: 76; Martin 2013.

³⁶⁷ For the extensive influence of the Near East on early Greece, see, e.g., Burkert 1992; Morris 1992; Dalley and Reyes 1998; Rollinger 2001.

Gilg. SBV VI.22–91 and *Iliad* 5.334–430: see § 5.10); and the allusive techniques at issue are found to occur in our Greek and Near Eastern texts precisely in conjunction with those motifs; the inference is thus that the allusive techniques have migrated along with the motifs. The opposite model to polygenesis recommends itself here: to consider Greek and Near Eastern poetry as partaking of a ‘tradition’ in something approximately like the sense in which Virgil and Homer partake of a tradition.³⁶⁸

Let us reconsider the seduction scenes attached to Inanna, Ishtar, Aphrodite, and Hera. The case was made earlier (§ 5.11) for a chain of reception: that the Sumerian Dumuzi–Inanna poetry is received by *Gilg.* SBV VI through the window of the Ur III Royal Hymns and *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*; that the Dumuzi–Inanna corpus is received by *Haph* through the window of something very like *Gilg.* SBV VI; and that *Haph* or **Anchises and Aphrodite* is received by *Iliad* XIV (and V), with ‘contamination’ from something very like *Gilg.* SBV VI. This extraordinary chain of reception exhibits continuity in the use of several allusive techniques: opposition in imitation, window reference, the mythological catalogue. The poets seem to be interested in ringing precisely the same kinds of changes on precisely the same (specific) motifs. The presence of such a chain of reception may be thought to bear out M. L. West’s (differently motivated) claim that ‘Greek literature is a Near Eastern literature.’³⁶⁹ According to the arguments of this book, this statement may be true in roughly the same kind of way that Latin poetry can be said to be a Hellen(ist)ic poetry.³⁷⁰

Or consider briefly the relationship between the Babylonian duo Gilgamesh–Enkidu and the Homeric duo Achilles–Patroklos.³⁷¹ On the one hand, we may say that the *Iliad* receives *Gilgamesh* simply by transferring several motifs attached to Gilgamesh and Enkidu to Achilles and Patroklos. The most striking motifs are: the mortal hero and his divine mother; the hero’s friend who dies before him and whose death prefigures his own; the hero’s great grief for his friend compared in a simile to a lion(ess) bereft of its cubs; and the friend’s revenant ghost embraced by the hero.³⁷² These motif transferences may collectively be expressed as: *Gilg.* SBV > *Iliad*. We may call this a

³⁶⁸ Contrast Hainsworth 1993: 33: ‘The similarities between Homer, Apollonius, Virgil, Tasso, Milton and the rest are not fortuitous; the similarities between *Iliad*, *Gilgamesh*, *Beowulf*, *Roland*, *Digenis*, *Manas*, etc., are at best attributable to similar causes (orality, war, religion, etc.), not to any filiation.’

³⁶⁹ M. L. West 1966: 31.

³⁷⁰ For a different view, cf. Haubold 2013a: 73: ‘The similarities between Greek and Akkadian epic... are best seen in terms not of literary borrowing but of a shared understanding of the universe and the place of human beings in it.’ Latin poetry as a continuation of Hellenistic Greek poetry: F. Cairns 1979; Papanghelis 1987; Hutchinson 1988: 277–354; Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 444–85; Clauss 2010.

³⁷¹ This paragraph summarizes arguments made more fully at Currie 2012a: 549–54.

³⁷² Cf., e.g., Rollinger 2011: 221–3. On the lion similes, cf. Haubold 2013a: 22–3.

first-order transference of motifs. On the other hand, the *Iliad* receives *Gilgamesh*'s own manner of receiving earlier poetry. The Standard Babylonian *Gilgamesh* had already allusively transferred motifs from the narrative of the death and funeral of Bilgames in the earlier Sumerian poem *Death of Bilgames* to its own narrative of the death and funeral of Enkidu in *Gilg.* SBV VII–VIII; the *Iliad* replicates that transference by allusively transferring motifs from the narrative of the death and funeral of Achilles in the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* to its own narrative of the death and funeral of Patroklos in *Iliad* XVI–XXIII. We may express this as: (Sumerian *Death of Bilgames* > *Gilg.* SBV VII–VIII) > (**Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* > *Iliad*). This is now second-order motif transference, the transference of a transference. It argues a high degree of self-consciousness on the part of the *Iliad* poet both about how he uses sources and about how his sources used their sources. The *Iliad* here appears to imitate *Gilgamesh*'s poetics of imitation.³⁷³

Much in scholarship revolves around coincidences: when to dismiss them, when to take them seriously, what significance to attach to them. We have found early Greek hexameter poetry to employ, in conjunction, both the same complex motifs and the same complex techniques of allusion as Near Eastern poetry, in not just one, but two sequences of reception (on the one hand, Inanna > Ishtar > Aphrodite > Hera; on the other, Bilgames–Enkidu > Achilles–Patroklos). It is hard to view these coincidences as just ‘coincidental’. (We have, in effect, a coincidence of coincidences.) The Near Eastern picture explored in this chapter gives us fresh reason to accept both that there is motif transference in the *Iliad* and that it is allusive in effect (not just an unconscious consequence of the compositional process; see § 1.5). But it has also made it possible to suggest whence such motif transference came into early Greek epic, viz. from the mythological poetry of the Near East. However, any inference that the *Iliad* either alluded to or inherited its poetics of allusion from Near Eastern poetry obliges us to confront a glaring paradox.

On the one hand, the influence of Near Eastern poetry on early Greek epic appears to have been pervasive. There was not just one narrow channel by which Near Eastern poetic motifs were received into early Greek epic. Historical (i.e. attested) Greek hexameter poems did not just receive Near Eastern poetic motifs via other historical Greek hexameter poems, but evidently had independent access to those Near Eastern poetic motifs. It was argued in this chapter that the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Haph* interact with one another, but also each independently with *Gilgamesh*. Similarly, it has been argued that the *Odyssey* draws on a pre-Homeric **Argonautica* that was influenced by *Gilgamesh*, but also that it draws independently on the Mesopotamian poem.³⁷⁴ Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Orphic *Theogony* in the Derveni papyrus draw

³⁷³ Currie 2012a: 554.

³⁷⁴ M. L. West 2005: 62–4 = 2011b: 308–11.

independently of one another on the Near Eastern succession and castration myth.³⁷⁵ The *Iliad* and Hesiod's *Theogony* likewise draw on different Near Eastern theogonic material.³⁷⁶ *Atrahasis* seems to have influenced the Cyclical *Titanomachy* and the *Cypria* independently.³⁷⁷ The same may be true of the influence of *Enuma elish* on Hesiod's *Theogony* and the *Cypria*.³⁷⁸ It appears that the Greek hexameter poets severally had independent access to Near Eastern mythology and/or poetry and, therefore, that it was felt to be part of their common cultural-literary background (possibly in translated form). We are dealing with a phenomenon that runs too wide and deep to be attributed to superficial exposure of a couple of poets to Babylonian poetry through a rudimentary schooling in a Near Eastern milieu. The striking representation of incipits among the early Greek hexameter receptions of Mesopotamian poetry (*Enuma elish*, *Atrahasis*) is no indication of this, given that incipits are specially favoured targets of allusion even for the most learned poets.³⁷⁹

On the other hand, few Greeks, to judge by the fifth-century evidence at least, appear not to have had the facility in foreign languages that such pervasive influence of Near Eastern poetry on early Greek hexameter poetry seems to presuppose.³⁸⁰ The case of Herodotus appears discouraging, those of Ctesias or Xanthus (to focus on the classical Greek historians of foreign peoples) perhaps less so.³⁸¹ The early epic poets, at least some of them, might have been exceptional. It would be convenient to conjecture that they typically went purposely to learn from singers in the culturally prestigious Near East, as Pythagoras is said to have done, learning Egyptian in the

³⁷⁵ Burkert 1987: 22 = 2003: 62; cf. 2004: 98; López-Ruiz 2010: 136–44 esp. 144.

³⁷⁶ M. L. West 1988: 171 = 2011b: 70–1.

³⁷⁷ *Atrahasis* and *Titanomachy*: S. R. West 1994; Bremmer 2008: 104–5, 115. *Atrahasis* and *Cypria*: ⇒ *Cypria* fr. 1.1–7 Bernabé.

³⁷⁸ Hes. *Th.* 116–210 (Ouranos, Gaia, Kronos) ~ *Enuma elish* I.1–78 (Apsu, Tiamat, Ea). *Cypria* (Momos, Zeus, Gaia) ~ *Enuma elish* I.29–54 (Mummu, Apsu, Tiamat)—if the narrative summarized at Σ D. *Il.* 1.5 lines 3–13 van Thiel belongs to the *Cypria* (see Currie 2015: 285–6).

³⁷⁹ Incipits and schooling: Burkert 1992: 95; 2004: 48; cf. Bremmer 2008: 3, 87–8. Incipits and allusion: Conte 1986: 35 with n. 5, 70. Horace and Greek lyric incipits: Clay 2010: 137–8; Race 2010: 156. Janko 1982: 227: 'In a wholly or predominantly oral culture the opening is likely to be the most familiar part of a poem'; A. D. Morrison 2007b: 122.

³⁸⁰ Persian could be spoken by Histiaios (Hdt. 6.29.2), and was learned by Themistokles (Thuc. 1.138.1; Nepos *Them.* 10.1) and allegedly Alkibiades (Athen. 12.535e). The Greeks as fundamentally 'monolingual': Momigliano 1975; Feeney 1998: 65–6; T. Harrison 1998: 3–9, esp. 9, 40–1; Mitchell 2007: 55; Lane Fox 2008: 222; Schironi 2009: 24–5; A. M. Bowie 2013: 171. A greater level of bilingualism is supposed by M. L. West 1997: 606–7; Hall 2002: 113–15 (with n. 114, countering Momigliano); López-Ruiz 2010: 29, 31–4; Haubold 2013a: 2, 22–3. Multilingualism in Crete: *Od.* 19.175–7 (cf. *Il.* 2.803–6, where 804a = *Od.* 19.175a; *Il.* 4.437–8; Janse 2002: 333–4). Inter-marriage and foreign nurses or domestic servants as facilitators of cross-cultural education: *Od.* 15.417–18; *HAph* 113–16; cf. Hdt. 4.78.1; M. L. West 1997: 618; López-Ruiz 2010: 34–6.

³⁸¹ Herodotus: T. Harrison 1998; cf. Munson 2005: 29 and n. 51; differently, Dalley 2003: 171, 175, 188. Ctesias: Llewelyn-Jones and Robson 2010: 55–6. Xanthus: West 2011e: 346 and n. 6.

process.³⁸² But, inconveniently, the evidence is lacking. That in itself is not very surprising.³⁸³ Yet it is disconcerting that, while the two Hesiodic poems present some of the clearest Near Eastern influences in all Greek hexameter poetry, the narrator of *Works and Days* claims never to have travelled abroad (650–1), in a passage which surveys his poetic career (656–9). A recent study of ‘wandering poets’ concludes that ‘Greek poets (*qua* poets) do not for the most part “wander” in search of knowledge or spiritual enlightenment.’³⁸⁴ In fact, an ancient tradition asserts that Homer did just this.³⁸⁵ Still, movement in the other direction seems in general easier to conceive. Thus we might imagine, with M. L. West and others, the early Greek hexameter poetic tradition being transformed by one or more gifted immigrant bilingual poets, either of non-Greek extraction or of mixed parentage, much as Latin poetry was transformed by the Greek-born Livius Andronicus.³⁸⁶ Perhaps not many such individuals may have been needed to have the requisite effect.³⁸⁷

If it is hard to account for how the poets may have become acquainted with Near Eastern poetry, it is still harder to posit a wide public capable of appreciating the allusion to such poetry.³⁸⁸ It is impossible to know how much Near Eastern mythology or poetry audiences would know. As always, it must have varied: a Cypriot audience can have known more than an Athenian one.³⁸⁹ If we wish to posit reasonably widespread knowledge of Near Eastern poetry on the part of audiences, we are perhaps bound to assume that it was possible to hear (the classics of) Near Eastern poetry performed in

³⁸² Pythagoras: Isocr. 11.28; Antiphon *BNJ* 1096 F1b. Not only Egypt, but Sardis (Hdt. 1.30.1) and Babylon (Str. 14.1.16 *Πυθαγόραν ἱστοροῦσιν... ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ Βαβυλῶνα φιλομαθείας χάριν*) appear as destinations.

³⁸³ Cf. Haubold 2013a: 2.

³⁸⁴ Hunter and I. C. Rutherford 2009: 16. They acknowledge that they do wander *qua* ‘holy men’ (ibid.); but the distinction between early Greek hexameter poets and ‘holy men’ is often difficult to draw: Bowra 1952: 19–20; Finnegan 1977: 207–10; Graf 1987: 100–1; López-Ruiz 2010: 188–95. López-Ruiz ibid. 189 raises the possibility of ‘international apprenticeship’ for early Greek *δημιουργοί* (carpenters, seers, healers, singers). However, evidence is wanting, even for physicians (R. Thomas 2004: 176–81). On Magnes of Smyrna, see M. L. West 2011e, esp. 348.

³⁸⁵ Diod. 1.12.10 and 1.97.7, after Hecataeus of Abdera; Str. 1.1.2, *alias* (Kim 2007: 366–8); Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 6. Hdt. 2.116.1 may be the start of this tradition.

³⁸⁶ M. L. West 1988: 171 = 2011b: 71–2; 1997: 588, 607–8, 610–11, 622, 629; cf. 1995: 216–17 = 2011b: 205; Bachvarova 2005: 149; 2016: 46–9 (parallels with Slavic and Turkic epic), 426–9. Cf. S. P. Morris 1997: 608; D’Alessio 2004: 29; I. C. Rutherford 2009: 33; Powell 2011: 560. Foreign-born Greek poets in the archaic period include the Lycian Olen and the Lydian (?) Alcman (Hunter and I. C. Rutherford 2009: 10–11).

³⁸⁷ Bachvarova 2016: 49: ‘a single man can be responsible for the transfer of an epic from one language to another, and only a few bilingual bards could have a major effect’; cf. 428.

³⁸⁸ The audience as capable of such appreciation: Penglase 1994: 237–8. Differently, Haubold 2006: 8 n. 23.

³⁸⁹ → Audience knowledge.

Greek hexameter translations.³⁹⁰ The (easier?) alternative would seem to be to accept that only a small proportion of an audience (chiefly other bilingual poets?) were able to appreciate the allusion to Near Eastern sources. To make such a concession would not necessarily compromise the popular appeal of the poems as a whole (see § 1.6). Nor would it undermine the argument for allusion itself, which does not presuppose that the allusion was necessarily appreciated by all or even most of the audience.³⁹¹ It is problematic, if tempting, to make an appeal to the audiences, who elude us, determinative of the meaning of the texts, which we do have.³⁹² Perhaps we should not exclude the possibility that some (bilingual?) poets composed in this way just because they could, because it was the way they worked, or because they were themselves somehow significantly connected to the literary and cultural world of the Near East, and wished their poems to be. We might hypothesize an aspiration on the part of an ambitious and accomplished (bilingual?) poet to produce a Greek ('Panhellenic') epic poetry that was connected to the most prestigious international poetry and could hold its own with it. A small but culturally significant target audience of Greek-speaking non-Greeks (like our hypothesized bilingual poet himself) might also be entertained.

Here the speculative conclusions of a literary inquiry outstrip certainly what we know and perhaps what we feel comfortable surmising about the historical realities of the reception of Near Eastern poetry into Greek epic poetry. We are indeed faced with large historical imponderables. First, whether certain classics of third- and second-millennium Mesopotamian poetry, originally composed in Sumerian and Akkadian (Dumuzi–Inanna songs, *Gilg.* SBV, etc.), continued to be appreciated in the Near Eastern literary culture of the first

³⁹⁰ Greek versions of *Gilgamesh* are mooted by M. L. West 2005: 64 = 2011*b*: 311; 2011*f*: 314; 2014: 31–2; cf. Edmunds 2005: 34. Differently, the Greeks as uninterested in translating foreign literary texts: Most 2003: 386.

³⁹¹ Cf. Prof. R. L. Fowler, *per litteras*, 2011: 'I have become suspicious of the appeal to the audience in a lot of Homeric criticism as the litmus test of allusion/intertextuality, as being circular in many cases, and also unnecessary: you need only prove that the intertext is possible in the linguistic community, not that the audience got it. It's not much good if nobody gets it, sure, but it might only be one person who gets it—someone as learned as the poet.' Hinds 1998: 49: 'even the poet's dialogue with the work of other poets can be a very private, self-reflexive and solipsistic kind of dialogue'.

³⁹² For a contrasting position, see Burgess 2015: 78–9: 'Homer and his listeners would not know the *Gilgamesh Epic*, even in translation. If motifs from the *Gilgamesh Epic* crossed over the Aegean, it is hard to see how they would have been recognized as such by Homeric audiences. Exciting as the correspondences may be for academics looking into the background of Homeric poetry, this does not mean that they have any significance within the epics.' For these problems in general, cf. Erp Taalman Kip 1990: 117: 'The meaning of a Greek tragedy is in its text. There is no sense in asking how much of this original meaning was actually grasped by the original audience.' Lyne 1994: 198: 'to limit interpretation to aesthetic effects which the imagined audience could supposedly grasp is wrong'; 'the poet may pack his text with meaning and effects way beyond what his immediate audience can grasp'.

millennium BC in the ways presupposed by this chapter (see § 5.11). Second, whether linguistic and cultural barriers could be overcome so as to enable Greek poets of the eighth–seventh centuries BC to come by an intimate knowledge and sophisticated understanding of that Near Eastern poetry. And third, whether there was the target audience to motivate and justify the Greek hexameter poets' engagement with that Near Eastern poetry in the complex and elaborate ways posited. If we wish to exclude these as historically unlikely, then it is open to resist the literary argument deriving an early Greek hexameter poetics of allusion from a Near Eastern poetics of allusion and return to the polygenetic model. Alternatively, if we see force in the literary argument, and consider that the coincidences indicated drive us away from the polygenetic model, then we may wish to entertain these historical assumptions, in some suitable form. 'Historical assumptions' and 'literary argument' are not, of course, just at loggerheads here: literary evidence and its interpretation are part of the historical picture. Literary interpretation is apt to be viewed as a soft and subjective datum (if a datum at all), compared to the 'hard' data furnished by history, archaeology, or historical linguistics; yet in some matters of early Greek history the distinction between 'hard' and 'soft' evidence is not easy to make. This literary inquiry has the credit at least of relying on evidence that is abundant (the poetic texts) and methods that, if subjective, are clear and open to scrutiny (the criteria of markedness and meaningfulness again). The poems may in fact offer our best evidence for what was possible in Greek–Near Eastern interactions, and our best chance of arriving at a thick description of what was involved in an archaic Greek reception of elements of Near Eastern culture.

The archaic Greek artists' reception of Near Eastern iconography, another part of the historical picture, may mislead us as to what to expect of the Greek hexameter poets' reception of Near Eastern mythological poetry. The artists' reception is seen to involve (creative) misunderstandings.³⁹³ But the transfer of iconography involves the reinterpretation of myth, loosened from its original cultural and linguistic contexts. This is the 'floating motif' model, which I have argued is not the model by which to conceive the early Greek epic poets' (most important) receptions of Near Eastern poetry.³⁹⁴ The poetic transfers with which we have been chiefly concerned remain vitally embedded in their respective cultural and linguistic contexts, and culturally informed bilingual poets are the persons most likely to be responsible for these transfers. It would then be a mistake to conceive the poets' enterprise in the light of the artists'. The artists may be thought a more reliable guide to audiences'

³⁹³ Burkert 1987: 25–9 = 2003: 64–9.

³⁹⁴ See § 5.10. Cf. M. L. West 2014: 31: 'Most of the parallels are not just free-floating motifs but embrace whole scenic structures and sequences.'

comprehension of Near Eastern traditions; but it is unclear how far even that may be the case; Kleitias' depiction of the funeral games for Patroklos on the 'François Vase', for instance, fails to show that early sixth-century audiences were ignorant of the *Iliad*.³⁹⁵

The conclusions of this chapter have been both larger than those of other chapters, and couched in even larger uncertainties. At the very least, we can say that the Near Eastern picture is critical to an appraisal of the neoanalytical method and of the argument for an allusive art in early Greek hexameter poetry—whether we wish to see it as providing merely a comparandum (on the polygenetic model) or as the actual source whence an allusive art passed into the Greek, and hence the classical, epic tradition.

³⁹⁵ Cf. Snodgrass 1998: 119–20; Burgess 2001: 81–2.

Epilogue: Traditional Art and Allusive Art

This Epilogue will not review the preceding chapters, which were previewed in the first chapter (§ 1.8), but will revisit instead a core theoretical issue explored there in the light of the four intervening chapters. The workings of an oral poetic tradition have been compared by J. M. Foley to the workings of language: ‘oral tradition works like language, only more so’.¹ But the statement highlights a key problem. Language, which succeeds so effortlessly in normal communication, eludes comprehension (or at least scholarly consensus) on the theoretical level. The relationship that traditional referentiality posits between the Tradition and individual poetic performances has been compared with the relationship between the *langue* and *paroles* of Saussurian linguistics.² In the explicitly stated aim of reconstructing the traditional ‘grammar’ of early Greek epic, exponents of traditional referentiality often invoke the structuralist model.³ That model is open to various types of criticism, of which one is Bakhtin’s ‘dialogism’.⁴ According to one writer on intertextuality:

All utterances are *dialogic*, their meaning and logic dependent upon what has previously been said and on how they will be received by others. The abstract linguistics of Saussure strips language of its dialogic nature.⁵

This book has found early Greek hexameter poetry also to be vitally dialogic. But, no less vitally, that dialogue is not to be found everywhere, or in all

¹ J. M. Foley 1999: xii, 6, 169, and *passim*; 2002: 127–8; cf. 1997: 166–7. Cf. Page 1959: 222–3; Lord 1960: 35–6.

² Clark 2004: 130; cf. 1997: 13; Sacks 1987: 19; Bakker 2013: 160 n. 5. Cf. Ford 2012: ‘Nagy’s ultimate concern ... is the Tradition, the ever-evolving medium that generated (in a Chomskyan sense) Homeric poetry.’ Ben-Amos 1984: 121–2, on ‘tradition’ as equivalent to *langue* or Chomskyan ‘competence’ in folklore research. Conte 1986: 27 ‘Tradition can be defined simply as poetic “language”.’

³ J. M. Foley 1990: 7. Cf. Lord 1960: 35–6, 65; Austin 1975: 80; Sacks 1987: 23; Reece 1993: 1–2; Allan 2005: 14.

⁴ Schmitz 2007: 66–7.

⁵ G. Allen 2011: 19. Cf. Bakhtin and Volosinov 1986: 95: ‘Language acquires life and historically evolves ... in concrete verbal communication, and not in the abstract linguistic system of language, nor in the individual psyche of speakers.’

directions.⁶ The book has attempted to document some of the characteristics of this dialogue: in particular, the → ringing of changes on a specific motif, typically with → opposition in imitation or its close relative, → *Umkehr in Wiederkehr*. In the previous chapter we observed this with the mythological catalogue, where the changes are rung in the identity of the speaker (whether male or female, mortal or immortal), the situation (e.g. whether the wounding is emotional or physical), and the rhetorical function of the catalogue (whether to urge the commencement of sexual relations or justify their termination; see § 5.13). We observed it also with the motif of the beautifying bath.⁷ We are dealing, as often in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, with a climactic series of motifs in which the later members recur specifically to the earlier, not to an abstract template that is merely the generic property of the Tradition.⁸

Let us illustrate the point further with another well-known example of arguable verbatim quotation of the *Iliad* by the *Odyssey* (compare § 2.1). In the *Homilia*, Hector says to Andromache, πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει, 'war shall be a concern to men' (*Il.* 6.492). Here ἄνδρεσσι is the marked term (designating men, not women), and μελήσει amounts to 'leave it to me', i.e. 'you stay out of it!' The same phrase is subsequently addressed by Poseidon to Hera in the *Theomachia* (*Il.* 20.137 πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει), but ἄνδρεσσι is now differently marked (designating men, not gods), and the sense of μελήσει is 'leave it to them', i.e. 'let us stay out of it!' The latter occurrence should be seen as a specific reprise of the former. There are strong thematic links between each passage's wider narrative contexts in *Iliad* V–VI and XX–XXI respectively; the divine action of the latter narrative sequence mirrors and parodies the human action of the former.⁹ Here is, then, an intratextual dialogue within the *Iliad*. This intratextual Iliadic dialogue is then elaborated, first, as an intertextual dialogue between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*, and then subsequently as a further intratextual dialogue within the *Odyssey* itself.¹⁰ We see the motif three times in the *Odyssey*: twice in the words of Telemachos to Penelope (1.358–9, 21.352–3 μῦθος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει / τόξον δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει, 'the topic of singing / the question of the bow will be a concern to men'), once in the words of Alkinoos to Arete (11.352–3 πομπή δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει, 'the question of the send-off will be a concern to men'). The wider narrative contexts of the three Odyssean passages are again all strongly thematically linked: in *Odyssey* I, Phemios sings of the homecoming of the

⁶ Thus I do not discern a dialogue (of the kind envisaged) between Hesiod and Homer; yet a strong and meaningful dialogue is discernible between the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* (though not vice versa), and also between Hesiod's *Works and Days* and *Theogony* (not vice versa).

⁷ ⇒ *Od.* 6.224–45, 8.454–68, 23.115–16, 153–240, 24.365–74: see § 5.14, pp. 189–91.

⁸ See, in general, e.g. Schwabl 1982; R. B. Rutherford 1985.

⁹ *Iliad* V–VI and XX–XXI: see § 5.15, pp. 196–7. Divine and human action: cf. Burkert 1997: 258 = 1960: 140.

¹⁰ See Usener 1990: 47–66; Kullmann 1991: 444 = 1992: 120; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 140–2 and n. 42; differently, J. Griffin 1991: 290; Danek 1998a: 61–2.

Achaeans in Odysseus' hall; in *Odyssey* IX–XII, Odysseus narrates his own wanderings in Alkinoos' hall ('like a singer', 11.368); and in *Odyssey* XXI, Odysseus plies the bow in his own hall ('like a man skilled in the lyre and singing', 21.406).¹¹ The three scenes bring Odysseus' homecoming into increasingly sharp focus: first, Phemios on Ithaca sings of the homecomings of the Greeks in general terms; then Odysseus tells of his own homecoming to the Phaeacians on Scheria; and finally Odysseus on Ithaca demonstrates to the suitors the palpable reality of his homecoming, with bloody consequences. In each case, a woman's intervention is forestalled: Penelope's in the first and third instances, Arete's in the second. Arete is, moreover, a kind of Penelope figure in Scheria (note, strikingly, *Od.* 11.345 βασιλεία περίφρων!).¹²

In such a situation, how happily could we say of ||...δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει | that 'the phrase is formulaic'?¹³ It would appear to commit us to recognizing a 'block formula', of four lines (*Il.* 6.490–3 = *Od.* 1.356–9 = *Od.* 21.350–3).¹⁴ U. Hölscher pointed out the difficulty:

The theory of oral composition must assume that here both the *Odyssey* poet and the *Iliad* poet reach back to the great arsenal of formulas in the rhapsode's memory. But is it conceivable that there was a formula of this sort, for all occasions when a hero's wife interfered in men's business? Was the formula worthwhile? It seems to me unmistakable that there is a quotation here: Telemachos does not speak a formulaic utterance, but a Hektor utterance, pointedly varied; the youth who has just been stirred to manhood speaks in Hektor mode.¹⁵

The relationship between the *Iliad* VI scene and the *Odyssey* I scene is interpretable as an instance of → opposition in imitation. Telemachos and Penelope broach the subject of Odysseus' (non-)return from Troy, while Hektor and Andromache broach that of Hektor's (non-)return from battle; as V. Di Benedetto has said, '[t]he link between the passages [*sc.* *Odyssey* I and *Iliad* VI] is clear, but the outcome is different, as Hector really dies in the poem, Odysseus does not'; '[t]he pattern of the wife that cries for the husband that is not yet dead is valid for Penelope as it was for Andromache, but

¹¹ Cf. R. B. Rutherford 1985: 142–3.

¹² See further § 2.2 on Penelope and Arete.

¹³ Citation from M. W. Edwards 1991: 307. Differently, Heubeck 1989: 99 on *Od.* 11.353–4: 'Modelled on *Il.* vi 492–3, but intentionally varied as at i 358–9 and [xxi] 352–3'; Fernández-Galiano 1992: 190: 'Hector's words to Andromache in the *Iliad* are obviously the most ancient occurrence; from it the others derive.'

¹⁴ Cf. Hainsworth 1993: 20: 'The longer a formula the more likely it is to lose its cohesion and fall apart, yet when groups of two or three or six verses are repeated chance is an implausible explanation of how such runs of verses arise. It may be that a second occurrence is a deliberate echo of the first, or that it is an unconscious echo of the first, or that the coherence of the thought expressed leads to the same phrases coming to mind independently on each occasion, or that the group of verses exist as a block, a kind of super-formula.' Cf. Mueller 1984: 150; 2009: 156–62; Di Benedetto 1994: 188 and n. 1. Differently, Clark 1997: esp. 64–6, on our passages, and 159–61, 221–30, and *passim*, on 'formula chains' in general.

¹⁵ Hölscher 1988: 40 (translated); cf. 1978: 64–5. Cf. Usener 1990: 56–8.

Penelope fell asleep, Andromache did not'.¹⁶ Elsewhere in the first books of the *Odyssey*, the missing (or 'departed') Odysseus evokes the Iliadic Hektor (see § 2.1): here the role of the Iliadic Hektor is split (in another example of → multiple correspondence) between Odysseus and his allusive → doublet Telemachos (see § 4.5). We may thus recognize *Odyssey* I as making specific intertextual allusion to *Iliad* VI (as *Iliad* XX had already done, intratextually). Thereafter *Odyssey* XI and XXI make intratextual play with the motif, now established by its occurrence in book I of that poem as a distinctive Odyssean motif; they no longer hark back to *Iliad* VI. (A similar argument was made in Chapter 5 for specific intertextual allusion of *Iliad* 5.337–430 to *Gilg. SBV* VI.22–91, followed by specific intratextual allusion at *Iliad* 5.859–906, 21.479–514: see §§ 5.10, 5.15.) Here again we are able to observe that the narratives of the poems 'flow in a single direction'.¹⁷

None of this is to deny the possibility that there was an inherited typical scene of the Warrior's Departure, in which the man may have given the woman instructions.¹⁸ It is, however, to raise serious doubts whether the nature of the relationship between these passages can be adequately explained in these terms. The doubts are intensified by the recognition of an apparent incongruity in the Odyssean passages.¹⁹ It makes very obvious sense for Hektor in *Iliad* VI to tell Andromache to return εἰς οἶκον.²⁰ But the same injunction is out of place with Telemachos and Penelope in *Odyssey* I and XXI (*Il.* 6.490 = *Od.* 1.356, 21.350; similarly *Il.* 6.495 οἰκόνδε βεβήκει | = *Od.* 1.360, 21.354). Penelope, who never leaves the house, would more properly be sent to her room (so *Od.* 1.362 = 21.356 ἐς δ' ὑπερῶ' ἀναβᾶσα).²¹ Again the Odyssean passages appear to be a secondary modification of the *Iliad* VI passage.

¹⁶ Di Benedetto 2001: 8, 9 (considered by him an example of 'variation' in 'reuse'; cf. → *Umkehr in Wiederkehr*). Differently, Danek 1998a: 61–2: 'die Annahme, daß mit dem Zitat der gesamte Kontext der Hektor-Andromache-Szene mit evoziert sei, verleiht jedoch den Szenen zwischen Telemachos und Penelope und erst recht der Szene zwischen Alkinoos und Arete keinen zusätzlichen Sinn'. (I dissent from the first, but assent to the second claim.)

¹⁷ Citation from Taplin 1992: 10; see Appendix E. Differently, Heubeck 1954: 52, seeing in *Il.* 6.490–3 the primary use of the motif, with *Od.* 21.354–8 as a first and *Od.* 1.360–4 a second interaction with it.

¹⁸ Cf. J. Griffin 1991: 290, discussing Usener 1990: 56–8.

¹⁹ Kullmann 1991: 444 = 1992: 120: 'Inkaufnahme von sprachlichen Härten'.

²⁰ Cf. *Il.* 3.390: Helene summoned home (οἰκόνδε) from the tower of Troy.

²¹ Cf. Hölscher 1978: 64; M. L. West 2014: 70; cf. 151 n. 17. To say that the Odyssean usages of εἰς οἶκον and οἰκόνδε are less appropriate than the Iliadic ones is not to say that they are unworkable in context: we may understand easily enough that Penelope is being dismissed to '(the rest of) the house', to her '(real) home', or similar; cf. Fernández-Galiano 1992: 190; M. Schmidt 1999: 568.7–10, 572.19–21. All the same, the meaning of οἶκος here is evidently stretched. The closest parallel seems to be *Od.* 23.292 οἰκόνδε βεβήκει, of Eurykleia returning from Odysseus and Penelope's θάλαμος to the 'living quarters' of the palace. The parallel is imperfect; the θάλαμος of Odysseus and Penelope (on the ground floor: P. V. Jones 1988: 150) can more easily be felt to be separate from the rest of the house than the ὑπερῶν where Penelope has been sleeping since the advent of the suitors (cf. Heubeck 1992: 342). Another seeming

In sum, it is difficult here to suppose that the *Odyssey* responds to merely traditional uses of the motif, rather than to *Iliad* VI specifically. We seem to have a marked and interpretable dialogue, begun intratextually in the *Iliad* and continued first intertextually and then intratextually in the *Odyssey*. (We have repeatedly in this book seen transitions from → intratextuality to intertextuality and vice versa.) Later Aristophanes will offer a further variation that slots perfectly into this sequence: πόλεμος δὲ γυναῖξι μελήσει, ‘war shall be a concern to women!’ (*Lys.* 538), another specific allusion that rings a further change on the Homeric passages.²² As so often, the later passage, here from the fifth century, exposes a continuity of allusive poetics: we have here Iliadic and Odyssean specific allusions that are fundamentally of a piece with the Aristophanic one.

According to Plato’s Sokrates, a carpenter fashions a table by setting his sights on the ‘form’ of the Table (*Plat. Resp.* 596b6–9). In practice, however, it is nearly impossible to believe that real craftsmen failed to draw inspiration from the concrete items of furniture that they and their customers saw around them. The early Greek ‘craftsmen of song’ are not likely to have been different.²³ To return to the analogy between the workings of early Greek epic and the workings of language with which we began this Epilogue: a ‘usage-based’ conception of language may be more adequate than a Saussurian or Chomskyan one. A usage-based model, in M. Barlow and S. Kemmer’s definition,

is one in which the speaker’s linguistic system is fundamentally grounded in ‘usage events’: instances of a speaker’s producing and understanding language. ... The linguistic system is built up from such lexically specific instances, only gradually abstracting more general representations, such as phonemes, morphemes, and syntactic patterns, from the repetition of similar instances of use.²⁴

anomaly in the Odyssean passages is τοῦ for ἐμοῦ at *Od.* 1.359 = 11.353 = 21.353: a demonstrative, picking up the preceding ἐμοί, which may be the result of recasting *Il.* 6.493 τοί (relative, with antecedent πᾶσι). Fernández-Galiano 1992: 191 calls this use of demonstrative for first-person pronoun ‘noteworthy’; cf. Merry and Riddle 1876: 39; Kühner-Gerth II.i.643; Chantraine 1958–63: ii.159.

²² Sophocles’ *Ajax* is another fifth-century play showing extensive allusion to the scene of *Iliad* VI; the *Odyssey* precedes it in the allusive chain. Cf. Hölscher 1978: 64–5; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 49. Note also Q.S. 1.469 ἀνδράσι δ’ ἡμετέροισι περὶ πολέμοιο μελήσει (spoken by Theano to the Trojan women, in the context of the Amazons taking the field against the Achaeans): ‘war shall be a concern for our husbands!’

²³ The *aoidos* as ‘craftsman’: *Od.* 17.383–5; cf. Pind. *P.3*.113; *Plat. Symp.* 209a4–5; Murray 1981: 98–9; Nagy 1996a: 89–91; Hunter and Russell 2011: 87.

²⁴ Barlow and Kemmer 2000: viii–ix. Cf. Croft and Cruse 2004: 3–4: ‘The third major hypothesis of the cognitive linguistic approach is that knowledge of language emerges from language use. That is, categories and structures in semantics, syntax, morphology and phonology are built up from our cognition of specific utterances on specific occasions of use’; 4 ‘the hypothesis is a response to approaches to syntax and semantics in which highly general and abstract schemas and categories, sometimes claimed to be innately given, are assumed to govern the organization of linguistic knowledge’.

It makes sense to see the “‘linguistic” system’ of early Greek hexameter poets and audiences as ‘fundamentally grounded in “usage events”’. We should allow traditional referentiality to have been an important part of early Greek hexameter poetics. Poets and audiences surely had the ability to ‘abstract more general representations’, such as formulae, type-scenes, and other traditional sequences. But this is likely to have been done ‘only gradually’, ‘from the repetition of similar instances of use’. The individual instances of use remain fundamental to the production and understanding of this poetry: they are not merely jetsam discarded to keep the ship of Tradition afloat, and our conception of early Greek hexameter poetry as oral-derived traditional poetry needs to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate this important fact.

APPENDIX A

Proclus' Summaries of the Cyclical Epics

Our knowledge of the Cyclical epics depends heavily on Proclus' summaries of those poems; it is therefore worth reminding ourselves how much, or how little, we know about him: about his identity, date, and the extent of the filter through which we access his summaries. The first two questions were touched on in Chapter 2 (§ 2.3). This appendix addresses the issue of the filter, both that affecting the way in which the archaic poems percolated to Proclus and how Proclus' work has percolated to us.

The Pre-Proclan Filter

The poems of the 'Epic Cycle' may have undergone various modifications in their transmission from the time of their composition and recording (presumably, the seventh–sixth centuries BC) down to Proclus' day (either the second or the fifth century AD).¹ First, there is likely to have been some curtailment, in the form of 'cropping' of the individual Cyclical poems around the Homeric poems and around each other, possibly before the Hellenistic period.² Some interpolation is also possible.³ Second, it is not clear whether Proclus read the poems themselves, in whatever state exactly they may have reached him. That depends in large part on how we interpret Proclus' statement as reported by Photius that 'the poems of the Epic Cycle are preserved (*διασώζεται*) and studied by many not so much for their excellence as for the sequence of the events in them' (Photius *Library* p. 319a30 Bekker = *Cyclus epicus* Test. 22 Bernabé).⁴ The prima facie implications of this statement—that the poems were extant in Proclus' day, and were read by him—are accepted by some scholars, resisted by others. There is no compelling reason to think that the statement was taken over mechanically by Proclus from an earlier source,

¹ See § 2.3, p. 55, on Proclus' date.

² The prose summaries, rather than the poems, as undergoing 'cropping': Davies 1989: 62; cf. M. L. West 2003a: 12; cf. 2013: 15–16. Cropping of the poems themselves, when arranged into a 'cycle': Monro 1883: 316–20; Burgess 2001: 17–19, 28–33; Scafoglio 2004a: 53–5; cf. Fantuzzi and Tsagalis 2015: 33–4. Compare the apparent cropping of the *Theogony* to accommodate it to the *Catalogue of Women*: M. L. West 1966: 48–9; Hirschberger 2004: 164; Hunter 2005: 1; Most 2006: p. il and n. 14; Cingano 2009: 105–6. Scodel 2012: 512–15 situates an impulse to create 'cycles' of poems with overlaps tolerated (i.e. without rigorous cropping) in the archaic epic poets themselves.

³ Interpolation, sometime after the fifth century BC, is one explanation of the discrepancy between Herodotus' and Proclus' accounts of Paris' return voyage to Troy in the *Cypria* (Hdt. 2.117; *Cypria* Summary Bernabé p. 39 lines 18–19): Bethe 1922: 204; Kelly 2006: 23–4; M. L. West 2013: 92 n. 30: 'a post-Herodotean interpolation to fit the *Iliad* reference, either in the actual epic ... or in the Proclan or pre-Proclan prose tradition'. The interpolation will predate Ps.-Apollod. (i AD?), if the *Cypria* is the source of *Epit.* 3.4. And it will predate Virgil, if the *Cypria* is a source (conflated with the Iliadic *Dios apate*) of the storm episode in *Aeneid* I.

⁴ For this way of reading poetry, cf. Plut. *quomodo adulescens* 30d ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσι τῶν ποιημάτων ὁ μὲν ἀπανθίζεται τὴν ἱστορίαν, and ibid. τὸν μὲν φιλόμυθον.

in whose day it was valid, though not in his own.⁵ In M. L. West's view, both Proclus and Pseudo-Apollodorus depend ultimately on a (pre-)Hellenistic 'compendium of digests of the Cyclic poems', perhaps composed by one Phayllos (mentioned at Aristot. *Rhet.* 1417a15) in the second half of the fourth century BC; we may reckon with an indeterminate number of possible abridgement(s) of this compendium before it reached Proclus.⁶ The matter is not easily settled. Even if the poems existed in Proclus' day, digests of them certainly did, and Proclus is likely to have used them.⁷

The Post-Proclan Filter

We know of Proclus' summaries through two sources: a discussion of Proclus' work in Photius' *Library* (no. 239); and various manuscripts of the *Iliad*, especially the tenth-century Venetus A, which preserve the summaries.⁸ It cannot be assumed that these latter had access to Proclus' *ipsissima uerba*, rather than to just a distillation of Proclus' original work.⁹ This question, which will occupy us for a while, intersects with the question whether the book read by Photius in the ninth century was an abridgement of the Proclan original or the unabridged original itself. Photius states, in ambiguous language: ἀνεγνώσθη ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιγραφομένου βιβλίου Πρόκλου χρηστομαθείας γραμματικῆς ἐκλογαί (Bibl. 239 = p. 318b22 Bekker = § 1 Severyns). This may mean, 'Read the book entitled: "Proclus' *Selections of Useful Literary Learning*"'; i.e. the title of Proclus' work was *Χρηστομαθείας Γραμματικῆς Ἐκλογαί*, which Photius read in unabridged form. Or it may mean, 'Read the book entitled: *Selections from Proclus' "Useful Literary Learning"*'; i.e. the title of Proclus' work was *Χρηστομάθεια Γραμματική*, of which Photius read an abridgement. Photius did read several works in the form of abridgements or digests (ἐκλογαί).¹⁰ Thus, 'Read *Selections from the God-Pleasing Life of Gregory*' (Bibl. 252 p. 466b Bekker ἀνεγνώσθη Ἐκλογαί Τοῦ Θεαρέστου Βίου Γρηγορίου; but see further below). 'Read *Miscellaneous Extracts* in twelve books by Sopatros the sophist' (Bibl. 161 p. 103a Bekker ἀνεγνώσθη Ἐκλογαί Διάφοροι ἐν βίβλοις ιβ' Σωπάτρου σοφιστοῦ); compare, on the eighth of these twelve books, 'Book 8 is another selection from an early text; the compiler's name is not recorded' (Bibl. 161 p. 104a Bekker ὁ δὲ ὄγδοος ἐκ τόμου τινὸς ἀρχαίου ἐκλογαί καὶ αὐτὸ τυγχάνει τὸ βιβλίον οὐκ ἔχον ἐπιγραφόμενον τὸν συνηθροικότα).¹¹ 'Read the four books of Ioannes Stobaeus' *Eklogai, Apophthegmata, Hypothekai* [*Selections, Sayings, Precepts*]' (Bibl. 167 p. 112a Bekker ἀνεγνώσθη Ἰωάννου Στοβαίου Ἐκλογῶν, Ἀποφθεγμάτων, Ὑποθηκῶν βιβλία τέσσαρα). There, *Eklogai* is plainly a title; but in some cases it is unclear whether Photius was reading *Selections*, i.e. an epitomized work, or simply himself reading selectively in an unabridged work.¹² The latter seems to be the case at Bibl. 258 p. 477b

⁵ Pace Rzach 1922: 2353.59–2354.18; Horsfall 2003: 470; M. L. West 2013: 9–10, 25. See, rather, Allen 1908: 68–72; Burgess 2001: 28; Scafoglio 2004a: 42–3; cf. 53–4, 57; 2004b: 298–9.

⁶ Davies 1986: 105–6; M. L. West 2013: 14–15, 23–6; Fantuzzi and Tsagalis 2015: 35.

⁷ Cf. Bethe 1922: 205–6.

⁸ For the manuscripts in question, see Severyns 1938–63: iii.19–58.

⁹ Monro 1883: 305, 306–7.

¹⁰ Sometimes Photius gives no indication of having read a text in epitomized form, though one was available. Thus, in the case of Pseudo-Apollodorus' *Library*, variously epitomized, the assumption is that he read a complete copy: Smith and Trzaskoma 2007: xxxviii; Photius *Bibl.* 186 pp. 142a–b Bekker.

¹¹ Translation after N. G. Wilson 1994: 143, 144.

¹² See Treadgold 1980: 41–2, 46–7 (with a further explanation of Photius' use of ἐκλογή).

Bekker ἀνεγνώσθη ἐκ τοῦ λόγου ὃς ἐπιγράφεται..., where it seems preferable to understand with R. Henry, ‘Read in part the work entitled...’, rather than with N. G. Wilson, ‘Read an abridgement of the work entitled...’.¹³ There was the same ambiguity with *Bibl.* 252 (cited above), where we also have the option of taking the Greek as ἀνεγνώσθη ἐκλογαὶ Τοῦ Θεαρέστου Βίου Γρηγορίου, ‘Read extracts of *The God-Pleasing Life of Gregory*’.¹⁴ We can at least be sure that in *Bibl.* 239 ἀνεγνώσθη... ἐκλογαὶ does not mean ‘read selectively’, since after ἀνεγνώσθη ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιγραφομένου βιβλίου..., the book’s ‘epigraph’ must follow immediately in the nominative case, in inverted commas, as it were: Πρόκλου χρηστομαθείας γραμματικῆς ἐκλογαὶ is thus assured as the title of the work that Photius read.

On balance it seems more likely that the work entitled Πρόκλου χρηστομαθείας γραμματικῆς ἐκλογαὶ that Photius read was an abridgement, and that the title of the work abridged was Χρηστομάθεια Γραμματική.¹⁵ This is the title of Proclus’ work given subsequently by Photius (*Bibl.* p. 322a39 Bekker = Severyns § 100 τῆς Πρόκλου Γραμματικῆς Χρηστομαθείας) and also in the Venetus A manuscript of the *Iliad*. The title Χρηστομάθεια Γραμματική, *Useful Literary Learning*, already suggests a selection or digest of what it is ‘useful to know’.¹⁶ *Chrestomathia* can be the title of an original work; one was composed by the fourth-century AD grammarian Helladius, and by Herennius Philo in the first-second centuries AD (unless the latter’s title was *Peri Chrestomathias*).¹⁷ Given that χρηστομάθειαι is a virtual synonym of ἐκλογαί,¹⁸ it is questionable whether an author would have conferred on his own work a title Χρηστομαθείας... Ἐκλογαί: effectively, *Selections of Selections of...*¹⁹ There is scope for further uncertainty about the title too. In the case of Strabo, Στράβωνος γεωγραφικῆς χρηστομαθείας denotes ‘useful selections’ made by someone other than

¹³ Henry 1959–91: viii.18: ‘Lu en partie l’écrit intitulé...’; N. G. Wilson 1994: 231, with 243 n. 1: ‘Photius seems to have read an epitome of a biography of Athanasius... Theoretically one could also translate “I have read part of...”’.

¹⁴ So Henry 1959–91: vii.207: ‘Lu des extraits de la vie, agréable à Dieu, de Grégoire’; N. G. Wilson 1994: 228: ‘Read selections from the *Life* of Gregory, beloved of god.’

¹⁵ So Monro 1883: 305 [Photius] had before him, not indeed the original work—few grammatical treatises had the good fortune to survive in their integrity—but extracts (ἐκλογαί), of which our document [sc. the summaries in the Venetus A] was part.’ Allen 1908: 65: ‘Photius... found [Proclus’ *Chrestomatheia*] in an epitome (ἐκλογαί), and gave an abstract of the epitome a place in his Library.’ Differently, Severyns 1938–63: ii.31; cf. 65–9, i.173–7, 267; Henry 1959–91: v.155 with 155–6 n. 2. Severyns 1938–63: ii.69 argues that Proclus’ *Chrestomatheia* was not sufficiently famous, classic, or voluminous to have been published in epitomized form. But Pseudo-Apollodorus’ *Library* (in three books, as opposed to the *Chrestomatheia*’s four) was epitomized more than once (‘Vatican Epitome’ and ‘Sabbaitic Epitome’): Smith and Trzaskoma 2007: xxxviii–xxxix.

¹⁶ M. L. West 2013: 4; cf. LSJ s.v. χρηστομάθεια, ‘book containing a summary of useful knowledge or passages’.

¹⁷ For Helladius’ *Chrestomatheiai*, see Photius *Bibl.* 279 ἀνεγνώσθη ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδιου Βησαντίνου ἐπιγραφομένης πραγματείας Χρηστομαθειῶν α’ β’ γ’ δ’, ‘Read selectively from the treatise of Helladius of Byzantium entitled *Chrestomatheiai* books 1–4’; cf. EM 685.57 Βησαντίνος ἐν τῷ περὶ Χρηστομαθείας, [sc. Helladius] of Byzantium in his work on *Chrestomatheia*. For Herennius Philo’s *Chrestomathia*, see EM 227.53–4 Ἑρέννιος Φίλων ἐν τῷ περὶ Χρηστομαθείας. (In the case of both *Etymologicum Magnum* entries, it is likely that *περί* was not part of the title.)

¹⁸ For χρηστομάθειαι as a synonym of ἐκλογαί, compare the headings prefaced to each book in the summary of Strabo: χρηστομάθειαι ἐκ τῶν Στράβωνος Γεωγραφικῶν βιβλίων α’, etc.

¹⁹ But see M. L. West 2013: 9: ‘the *Chrestomathy* appears to have been made up largely of material reproduced from earlier writers... The aptness of Ἐκλογαί in the title becomes clear.’

Strabo of his original, entitled *Γεωγραφικά*.²⁰ It is therefore also at least conceivable that *Πρόκλον Χρηστομάθεια Γραμματική* means ‘useful selections of the *Γραμματικά* of Proclus’. In other words, that the title of the original was *Γραμματικά*, and that *Χρηστομάθεια Γραμματική* represents a first stage of excerpting, and *Χρηστομαθείας Γραμματικῆς Ἐκλογαί* a second stage.²¹

Photius therefore may have read Proclus’ work in a form that had been abridged at least once and maybe twice. It is a question then whether the Proclan material that is preserved in the Venetus A manuscript derives from the same or a similar abridgement of Proclus as Photius knew. If we consider the Proclan material preserved in the Venetus A to be so spare as to be incapable of (further) abridgement, and if we accept that an abridgement of Proclus’ work was made (if Photius read such), then we should conclude that the Proclan material in the Venetus A is or derives from an abridgement of Proclus’ work. Proclus’ own summary will then have been less skeletal than what we are now able to read.²² It goes without saying that pre-Proclan summaries, such as the ‘compendium of digests’ by Phayllos posited by M. L. West, that would have been available to authors such as Virgil or Quintus to use (whether they did so or not) may therefore have been appreciably ampler than the extant summaries (which may make us slightly more sanguine about the prospect of reconstructing detailed motifs of the Cyclical poems on the evidence of these poets).²³

The Proclan material was first prefixed to Homeric manuscripts some time prior to the tenth century (the Venetus A).²⁴ Whoever first prefixed it, according to the foregoing argument, may have been working with an abridgement (or an abridgement of an abridgement) of Proclus’ *Χρηστομάθεια Γραμματική* (or *Γραμματικά*). The further question is how he worked with it, whether simply reproducing or modifying it.²⁵ On a large scale, the latter is obviously the case. Material known to have featured in the work read by Photius that was irrelevant to a preface to the Homeric poems has been excluded: for instance, the lives of Hesiod, Peisander, Panyassis, and Antimachus, and the summaries of theogonic epics.²⁶ However, on a smaller scale, it is unclear whether there was any comparable filtering of material in the actual summaries of the Trojan War epics. The original wording of Proclus seems in several places to have been taken over unchanged, in at least one place even where ill-fitting in its new context.²⁷

²⁰ Radt 2002–11: ix.346 lines 30–1.

²¹ *Γραμματικά* is attested as the title of a work by Eratosthenes: Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.16.79.3.

²² For a convenient illustration of the nature of the difference between a summary and an abridgement of a summary, see Smith and Trzaskoma 2007: xxxix, comparing the version of Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.206–7 with the equivalent version in the Vatican Epitome.

²³ → Virgil and Epic Cycle; → Quintus and Epic Cycle.

²⁴ M. L. West 2013: 7; Fantuzzi and Tsagalis 2015: 36.

²⁵ Modification: Severyns 1928: 245. Reproduction: Burgess 2001: 27–8.

²⁶ Contrast Photius *Bibl.* 239 Severyns 1938–66: ii.35–6 §§ 15–18 = Allen 1912: p. 96 line 31—p. 97 line 5.

²⁷ Severyns 1938–63: iii. 122; Davies 1986: 102; Burgess 2001: 26–7; M. L. West 2013: 6; Fantuzzi and Tsagalis 2015: 37–8. Thus, the summary in the *Iliad* manuscripts has an empty back-reference, *τούτοις*, and an empty forward-reference, *ὑστερον ἐροῦμεν* (Severyns 1938–63: iii *Procli fragmenta* lines 80–1 = Allen 1912: 102 lines 9–10; for its referent in Proclus’ original, cf. Photius *Bibl.* 239 Severyns 1938–66: ii. 37 §§ 22–3 = Allen 1912: 97 lines 12–19). For overlaps of wording in the Iliadic manuscripts and Photius’ *Library* no. 239, see Severyns 1938–63: iii *Procli fragmenta* lines 2–3 = Allen 1912: p. 99 lines 4–5 and Photius *Bibl.* 239 Severyns 1938–66: ii. 35 § 15 = Allen 1912: p. 96 lines 29–31).

Hence we may suppose that the Summary preserves its model (presumably the abridged rather than the unabridged Proclus) intact.²⁸

There is, however, no guarantee that this kind of fidelity was consistently applied. There is a suspicious tendency in the Summary to be relatively expansive on details in the *Cypria* (the poem for which the Summary is fullest) which confirm or at least complement the *Iliad*, and to pass over details in the *Cypria* which either contradict or have no relevance to the *Iliad*. The difference between the Summary and the source-authors who quote actual fragments of the *Cypria* is suggestive: the version of the Summary conforms to or does not contradict the version of the *Iliad* where fragments of the *Cypria* quoted by other authors suggest a divergent version. The source-authors are often precisely interested in the differences between the *Iliad* and the *Cypria*: for instance, Paris' return voyage from Lacedaemon to Troy (Hdt. 2.117: contrast Summary Bernabé p. 39 lines 18–19, consistently with *Il.* 6.290–2); the concealment of the young Achilles on Scyros (Mythographus Homericus in *Σ D Il.* 19.326; *Σ T Il.* 9.668; Paus. 1.22.6: absent from both the Summary and the *Iliad*); the capture of Briseis in Pedasos, rather than Lyrnessos (*Σ T Il.* 16.57: contrast *Il.* 2.690; the Summary is vague on this point, Bernabé pp. 42–3 lines 62–5). The summary of the Trojan Cyclical epics preserved in the *Iliad* manuscripts served to provide mythological background for a reader of the *Iliad*, and it is possible that the contents of the summary were modified in order to help it discharge this function.²⁹

The practical upshot of all this is not likely to be great. Without placing faith in the Summaries we can say very little about the Cyclical Epics at all, and an extreme scepticism towards them does not seem warranted.³⁰ All the same, it causes some discomfort to reflect on how mediated our access to the poems by this most crucial avenue is.

²⁸ Verbatim correspondences between epitomes and originals: Opelt 1962: 960–1, esp. 960: 'Im Vergleich mit ihren Originalen erweisen sich die Epitomai als redaktionell überarbeitete Exzerpte, d.h. es besteht weitgehend wörtliche Übereinstimmung.'

²⁹ Kullmann 1960: 204; cf. 253; Davies 1986: 103–4; 1989: 7–8, 41. Differently, Scafoglio 2004a: 46, 47 and n. 27.

³⁰ Bethe 1922: 205.

APPENDIX B

Translation of the Berlin Papyrus (Commentary on the Orphic Hymn to Demeter)

This appendix offers a translation of the ‘Berlin papyrus’ (P. Berol. 13044), discussed in Chapter 3. Verses quoted from the ‘Orphic’ poem are printed in **bold**. Dots are to give only an impressionistic sense of missing text.

- I [Orpheus was the son of Oiag]ros and Kalliope the
 [Muse, and the Mus]es’ king Apollo
 [inspired him, whence] he became possessed of the god and
 [composed the hymns] which Musaios slightly cor-
5 [rected and committed to w]riting; and he transmitted
 [the rites of Orpheus] to be venerated by Greeks and
 [barbarians, and i]n each article of worship he was me-
 [ticolous concerning] rites and mysteries and
 [purifications and] prophecies. Demeter the goddess
10
 . . . of Demeter
 . . . might lead (a life) (?). . . and . .
 . . . an enemy of hers (?).

No words can properly be made out for several lines.
- II 15 [O]rpheus... has recorded that she is Zeus’ sister,
 others his mother, of which nothing has been put
 into poetry worthy of the memory of the pious. For it¹ takes
 its beginning from the daughter of Zeus and Demeter, Per-
 sephone [plaiting violets] in the company of
20 [Okea]nos’ daughters, whose names
 are these from the verses of Orpheus: **Leukippe**
 and Phanere and Elektre and Ianthe and Melo-
 bosis and Tyche and Okyrhoe whose face is as a flower
 and Chryseis and Ianeira and Akaste and Admete
25 **and Rhodope and Plouto and charming Ka-**
 lypso and Styx and Ouranie and Galaxaure
 the lovely². . . sacrifice (?) . . .

30 daughter

Lacuna for some (?) lines.

¹ Sc. Orpheus’ hymn.

² Cf. *HDem* 418–23.

- III of the narcissus [to which Kore, h]aving marvelled at it, ran up;
and [as she] wished with her hands
35 to pluck this [for herself, then] it is said that the earth
gaped and that [out of the earth] Aidoneus came up
and on his chariot [of dark] steeds snatched
Kor[e and led her away]; and that Zeus with thunder
and lightning was lending succour to the black mares,
40 which are³ g[iven as f]odder (?) to the bowmanship of Artemis,⁴
Athene's of one sow. Of them
. umpire ill-⁵
. on the. . . of the
. and
45 in order that (?) she might [not] be derided for⁶ her playmates; and when
Demeter [hear]d her shouting
she came from Sicily and began to wander over
[the earth; but she (*sc.* Kore)]⁷ disappeared in the environs of the city
50
.
IV the grieving one⁸ groaned for the sake of
her daughter. And **Kalliope and Kleisidike**
and Damonasse⁹ with the queen came to
55 draw water and made enquiry of Deme-
ter as if she were some mortal woman. That for the sake of
some need she¹⁰ came Mousaios
says throughout his verses¹¹. in
trivial matters¹² it is right to ask the whole reason after a good
60 service ... (?) ... one who has fallen in love¹³ must weave in a ribbon
saffron, butcher's broom {*or:* and hyacinth} and dwarf irises {*or:* thistles} (?)
as a means to¹⁴ fair children (?)
. for the girl whose face is as a flower
Gaia by the will of Zeus doing a favour to the Much-Re-

³ For the use of the historic present, compare lines 81–2 below.

⁴ Apparently Artemis fired at Hades' horses; cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1315; Claud. *RP* 2.206, 232–3. N. J. Richardson 1974: 80, 290–1.

⁵ Or perhaps: Dys-/[aules]. ⁶ Less likely, 'by.'

⁷ Text after Buecheler 1905. Differently, Bernabé 392 F (1).

⁸ For the use of *τήν* and participle, cf. line 90. ⁹ Cf. *HDem* 109.

¹⁰ Either Demeter or the queen (Baubo).

¹¹ This translates the text offered by Kern after Buecheler ('sed pleraque obscura', Kern 1922, on 51–62). Differently, Bernabé 393 F line 4, following N. J. Richardson 1974: 80 (but the Greek must read: *χρείας* {δ'} *ἐν*[ε]κ *α* *τίνος παραγέγονεν*. δ[ι]ό): 'and made enquiry of Demeter, as if she were some mortal woman, for what reason she had come. That is why Mousaios says throughout his verses...'

¹² Or: 'in his (?) speeches / words' (Bernabé 393 F, after Colli).

¹³ For the association of ideas (being in love and picking flowers or fruits and wearing garlands), see Clearchus fr. 25 Wehrli; cf. Nonn. *D.* 10.338; Hor. *Carm.* 3.27.29–30.

¹⁴ Reading (with Allen) *ναῦλ'*; see the apparatus of Bernabé 388 F on this whole passage.

- 65 ceiver, gleaming wondrously, an object of awe then for all
to see, immortal gods and mortal
men, from whose root one hundred heads had
grown out¹⁵
Lacuna.
- V
- 70
.
.
.
75 Demeter was
asked by . . . she said
.
.
80 [r]eady
Lacuna.
- VI
- ... and B[[r]]aubo gives her her child for her to nurse it,
[and it loves] her [exceedingly];¹⁶ and she, agreeing to lodge
at her house with the child [rears it]
[as is right for a nu]rse, and anointing the child with ambrosia
85 [plac]ed it throughout the night in the fireplace, and in the morning,
without being noticed
[by the parents,] took it up; and as the child did not
[want] to suckle and did not take any other food,
[but wa]s well fed and good-looking, [Baubo]
became astonished at the well-being of the child and at night
90 p[er]ceiv[ing] [through] the door the one who had not noticed¹⁷ con-
c[eal]ing the child in the fireplace and supposing
[that unspeak]able things were going on, called out, ‘Child Demophon,
[the foreign woman] is hiding [you in a gre]at [fire] and is
making lamentation [and baneful woes for me].’¹⁸ [Then] Demeter became
95 sorely [angered] and [spo]k[e]: ‘Mindless men, suffering wretches,
knowing in advance [neither the ill] nor the g[ood co]m[ing on]....
For ... a most [headlo]ng foolishness at the end of the night
. snatched
. [But now there] is no way [he might elude d]eath
100 [and the fates].’¹⁹ And she p[la]ced on [the chi]ld and burns
VII and kills it and reveals her true identity;
for she says: ‘I am Demeter, bringer of seas[ons, giver of splendid]
gifts. Which heavenly god or who of mortal [men]
snatched Persephone and [deceived her dear]

¹⁵ Cf. *HDem* 8–12.

¹⁶ So Kern 1922, after Ludwich. Alternatively, ‘[and invites] her [to her home]’: Bernabé 396F, after Diels.

¹⁷ Compare above line 52 and note 8.

¹⁸ Cf. *HDem* 248–9.

¹⁹ Compare and contrast *HDem* 256–62.

- 105 **heart?**²⁰ And as retur-
 ned²¹ from the field
after he had dismissed (?)
 the mother, who the strange woman
 the daughter see[k say-]
 110 ing to the moth[er]
 and Demeter
 said.
 resp[onsible fo]r al[l le-]
 ft without a voice (?).
 115 s[aw (?)] the black [mares]
 god
 sow
 has been drunk until the
 to Tript[ol]emo[s
 120 Hence it²² is called 'Descent'.²³
*Not necessarily the end of the papyrus.*²⁴

²⁰ Cf. *HDem* 54–6.

²¹ The subject is taken to be Keleos by Bernabé 396 F; but see, more agnostically, N. J. Richardson 1974: 81. The subject in lines 107–10 is presumably Triptolemos or Eubouleus, if the 'mother' of 108 and 110 is Baubo.

²² The identity of the subject is uncertain: perhaps a place (in Attica?) or the poem.

²³ It is not clear whose descent, whether Persephone's or Demeter's (see § 3.5, p. 91). In lines 47–8, Bernabé 392 F, following Ludwig, reads *κατα- / [βᾶσα]*: 'after she [Persephone] had descended.'

²⁴ See N. J. Richardson 1974: 81; but contrast Wilcken, cited by Kern 1922 ad loc.

APPENDIX C

Allusive Doublets and Inconcinnities

Ubiquity of Doublets

Doublets are ubiquitous in early Greek epic, but it is unclear how many of these may be typologically generated and how many generated as a result of specific allusion.¹ It is, of course, true that Greek mythology too is 'full of doublets'.² Yet even in mythology some doublets may be the result of deliberate imitation and not always the result of independent generation; the mythology of Theseus, for instance, is modelled on that of Herakles.³ Latin poetry abounds in 'doubles' resulting from intertextual relationships.⁴ This appendix focuses on doublets in early Greek epic that are arguably the result of specific allusion.

'Inclusionary' and 'Exclusionary' Doublets

It will be helpful to draw an initial distinction between 'inclusionary' and 'exclusionary' doublets.⁵ We have inclusionary doublets when each member of the pair presupposes the presence of the other in the same text; the two are interdependent, and may be thought of as simultaneously conceived by the poet.⁶ An exclusionary doublet, by contrast, spans different poems, and here one member of the pair depends on the other in such a way that it presupposes both the prior existence of the other and its absence from its own text as logically or aesthetically incompatible with it. Examples of inclusionary doublets would be the *aristeiai* of Diomedes and Achilles in the *Iliad* or the Phaeacian and the Ithacan books in the *Odyssey*: each member of the pair depends on, and gains significance from, the other.⁷ An exclusionary doublet would be the plot line of the *Iliad* (where Hektor kills Patroklos, Achilles kills Hektor, and Paris and Apollo will kill Achilles) and the plot line of the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* (where Memnon kills Antilochos, Achilles kills Memnon, Paris and Apollo kill Achilles)

¹ Burgess 2006: 159–61; cf. Mueller 1984: 149–58. Doubling in the Epic Cycle: Kullmann 1960: 224; Burgess 2001: 144; cf. 1996: 86–7. In *Cypria*: Jouan 1987; Cingano 2011. In *Aethiopis*: Reinhardt 1960: 15.

² Citation from Fenik 1968: 237. See Howald 1937: *passim*.

³ Nilsson 1932: 164, 169; Mills 1997: 27–8.

⁴ Hardie 1993: 33–4; Hinds 1998: 111–12.

⁵ Burgess 2009: 62–3 distinguishes between 'doublet' and '*altera persona*'.

⁶ Cf. 'rule of progressive iteration' or 'Fenik's law' (after Fenik 1974: 180–8): R. B. Rutherford 2012b: 20; cf. M. W. Edwards 1991: 19–21. Simultaneous conception by the poet: cf. Lohmann 1970: 200, 202–3.

⁷ Tsagalis 2011: 220; M. W. Edwards 1991: 19, after Fenik 1968: 213–14. Cf. Lohmann 1970: 192, on 'Parallelgestalten', as 'bewußte gegenseitige Entsprechungen'.

(see § 2.3).⁸ Inclusionary doublets are an intratextual, exclusionary doublets an intertextual phenomenon.⁹

Chronological ('Whole War') Epics versus 'pars pro toto' Epics

A second distinction may also helpfully be drawn, which has at least conceptual validity, but is only controversially evidenced by the actual early epics of which we know: this is the distinction between continuous narratives (covering, say, the whole Trojan War) and synecdochic narratives (covering only part of the war, but evoking the whole). The *Cypria* is on one view assigned to the former category.¹⁰ The *Iliad* plainly belongs to the latter.¹¹ It has been argued that continuous narratives ('chronological epic') preceded synecdochic narratives in the history of early Greek epic.¹² Be that as it may, interaction between the two forms is clear on a synchronic level: a synecdochic narrative like the *Iliad* seems to exploit a continuous narrative, and a continuous narrative can also incorporate a synecdochic one. These claims will presently be illustrated below. But first we should indicate five different types of Trojan War narrative, based on different combinations of continuous and synecdochic narratives.

- (1) 'Chronological' poems, which narrated the whole Trojan War. For instance, hypothetical, unattested, pre-Homeric poems, and, possibly, the *Cypria*.

⁸ Kullmann 2005: 14: 'Hektor und Memnon schließen sich gegenseitig aus, ebenso Patroklos und Antilochos.' M. L. West 2003b: 7–8 = 2011b: 253 (cf. 2013: 150) supposes that when the poet composed *Il.* 18.96 he was still intending to narrate Achilles' death (see § 2.3 and § 3.4, p. 86). See rather, Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 191: 'Ein großes *Auf-hin* bleibt vor allem der Tod des Achilles, wie ihn gültig die Memnonis erzählt hatte. Homer denkt nicht daran, diesen Tod tatsächlich in sein Gedicht hereinzuziehen.' Cf. Dio Chrys. 11.110; cf. 96–7, 102, 106.

⁹ Compare and contrast Burgess 2005b: 122: 'Reflection of post-Iliadic myth within the *Iliad* might be considered a type of anticipatory doublet; what is anticipated lies outside the poem'; cf. Burgess 2006: 157. On my usage, exclusionary doublets 'anticipate' what lies outside the poem in a quite different way from inclusionary doublets.

¹⁰ *Cypria* as (originally) narrating the whole war: Burgess 1996: 90–2, 94 n. 63; 2001: 139–40, 143–4, 148. M. L. West 2013: 17–20 contrasts *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Aethiopis*, *Iliou Persis*, *Nostoi*, *Telegony*, as free-standing poems, with *Cypria* and *Little Iliad*, as 'a truly cyclic enterprise'. Cf. Rengakos 2015a: 157, 162, using the terms 'dramatic' and 'chronographic' epic respectively.

¹¹ Dowden 1996: 55–8, esp. 55: 'The *Iliad* tells within itself and is meant to tell within itself, by allusion, by reflection and by replay, the whole story of the Trojan expedition up to the fall of Troy and beyond'; Danek 2001: 167 with n. 10. See § 1.1.

¹² J. T. Kakridis 1949: 91–4, esp. 93: 'Immediately behind Homer there cannot be short compositions, independent ἀριστεῖαι and episodes, but chronographic epics which told of the Trojan war in large unitary compositions. I consider such an abrupt leap forward, from the small epic dealing with a single episode to the *Iliad*, impossible. The natural first step towards a longer composition is the chronographic and not the dramatic epic. Even if it is definitely proved that the poems of the epic cycle are more recent than Homer, we still have to admit that Trojan tradition had already been formulated before Homer's time in long chronographic epics.' Cf. Kullmann 1960: 365, 367; Heubeck 1974: 148; Thornton 1984: 10–11; Burgess 1996: 93, 94–5; 2001: 145. Compare and contrast Danek 2011: 304. Differently, Bethe 1922: 285–6; M. L. West 2002: 213 = 2011b: 400; 2006: 16–17; 2012: 233; 2013: 17, 58, 225; Scodel 2012: 511–12, esp. 512: 'There is...no evidence that any single poem tried to encompass the entire story of either Thebes or Troy.'

- (2) 'Synecdochic' poems, which narrate only part of the war, but evoke the whole. For instance, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.¹³
- (3) Chronological poems, which accommodate synecdochic poems of type (2).¹⁴ The *Cypria* is viewed as a poem of this type by those who see it as a chronological poem that sets out also to accommodate the narrative of the *Iliad*.¹⁵ Quintus of Smyrna's *Posthomerica* will be another later example.
- (4) A collection of discrete poems (of any of the preceding categories, (1), (2), and (3)), edited and cropped so as to yield an overarching contiguous narrative of the whole war, with minimal reduplication of material: this, of course, is intended as a description of our 'Epic Cycle'.¹⁶
- (5) A mythographer's narrative of the whole war: effectively, a continuous prose summary version of (4): for instance, the Pseudo-Apollodoran *Library* (see *Epit.* 3.1–7.40).

Inconcinnities and Superfluities

When continuous and synecdochic narratives are crossed, what were exclusionary doublets in the synecdochic narrative can be converted, not always entirely felicitously, into what we may call second-generation inclusionary doublets. Such second-generation inclusionary doublets often exhibit a reduplication that is aesthetically or logically jarring and is not found with first-generation inclusionary doublets (doublets that were conceived as inclusionary from the first). The co-presence of such 'infelicitous' doublets arises especially in narratives belonging to types (3), (4), and (5). Here are some putative examples.

The Memnon theme: Pseudo-Apollodorus (*Epit.* 4.6–8, 5.3–5) awkwardly accommodates the Patroklos–Hektor–Achilleus plot line of the *Iliad* to the Antilochos–Memnon–Achilleus plot line; the former had in fact probably been conceived by the *Iliad* poet as an exclusionary doublet of the latter (see § 2.3).

Achilleus' armour: the *Iliad* endows Achilleus with two suits of (divinely made) armour after the death of Hektor.¹⁷ This does not pose any immediate problem for the poet of the *Iliad*, who at *Iliad* 23.700–39 probably hints at, but does not go on to narrate, the *Hoplōn krisis*, which was probably already a traditional episode.¹⁸ However, it does pose a problem for any author wishing to create a continuous narrative that integrates the Iliadic narrative with the traditional episode of the contest of arms between Odysseus and Aias (a contest that presupposes a single set to compete for).¹⁹ This is the case with Pseudo-Apollodorus, who tacitly (or just unreflectively?) accepts the

¹³ e.g. Heubeck 1950: 25–6; Dowden 1996: 55–8.

¹⁴ Dihle 1970: 148: 'eine sekundär-chronologische Epik'.

¹⁵ So, e.g., Bethe 1922: 281–3; Heubeck 1950: 19; M. L. West 2013: 57.

¹⁶ Burgess 2001: 12–33; M. L. West 2013: 21–6. ¹⁷ See § 2.3, p. 60.

¹⁸ For *Il.* 23.700–39 (the wrestling contest between Odysseus and Aias at Patroklos' funeral games) as alluding to the *Hoplōn krisis* (which occurred at the funeral games of Achilleus, according to the *Aethiopis*, Summary Bernabé p. 69 lines 22–4; cf. *Od.* 11.546, with 24.85–92), see Kullmann 1960: 81–2, 335; Willcock 1973: 5; cf. N. J. Richardson 1993: 246. Probably traditional: the *Hoplōn krisis* is alluded to at *Od.* 11.544–51, and featured in the *Little Iliad* (Summary, Bernabé p. 74 line 3) as well as the *Aethiopis*.

¹⁹ See § 2.3, pp. 60–1.

problem: Achilles first lends his armour to Patroklos, loses it to Hektor, then receives a new set from Hephaistos, and after Achilles' death his armour is laid down as a prize for Aias and Odysseus to contend for (*Epit.* 4.6, 4.7, 5.6). The phrase 'his armour' (ἡ...πανοπλία αὐτοῦ) papers over the difficulty: which set? (Contrast the protestation of 'Protesilaos' at Philostr. *Her.* 47.3: Achilles only ever had one set of arms.)

Achilleus' funeral games: in a similar fashion, Pseudo-Apollodorus' narrative generates two sets of similar funeral games, one for Patroklos and one for Achilleus (Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 4.8, 5.5). The funeral games of Patroklos were probably an invention of the *Iliad*, conceived as an exclusionary doublet of the evidently traditional funeral games of Achilleus (see *Od.* 24.85–92; *Aethiopis*, Summary Bernabé p. 69 lines 23–4).²⁰ Pseudo-Apollodorus (already preceded by the Epic Cycle) turns these into repetitious second-generation inclusionary doublets. (The relationship between the funeral games for Patroklos and those for Achilleus cannot easily be argued to be a typological one by instancing the funeral games for Pelias: the two former are in a much closer relationship to each other than either are to the third.)²¹

Achilleus' 'best' friend: the *Odyssey* envisages two 'best' friends of Achilleus, Patroklos and Antilochos, both buried alongside Achilleus (⇒ *Od.* 24.76–9). Here it seems that the *Odyssey* is accommodating the *Iliad*'s joint burial of Achilleus and Patroklos (*Il.* 23.82–92) with a more traditional joint burial of Achilleus and Antilochos in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) tradition (see § 2.3).²² In the *Iliad*, Patroklos was conceived as an exclusionary doublet of Antilochos; the *Odyssey* creates a second-generation inclusionary doublet.

Trojan champions: the Epic Cycle knows of numerous successive defenders of Troy: Kyknos (*Cypria*), Hektor (*Iliad*), Rhesos (*Doloneia*: *Iliad* X), Penthesileia (*Aethiopis*, but perhaps from an originally separate **Amazonis*), Memnon (*Aethiopis*), Eurypylos (*Little Iliad*).²³ This superabundance can be variously explained. M. L. West supposed that of these all but Hektor were the character creations of post-Homeric poets looking for a way of spinning out the story.²⁴ However, it is not clear that these are in fact post-Homeric creations.²⁵ Another possible explanation of at least some of this superabundance is that some of the Trojan champions were initially developed as exclusionary doublets.²⁶ This is the view taken by neoanalysts of Hektor (in the *Iliad*)

²⁰ According to Kullmann 2005: 24–5, the funeral games for Achilleus featured in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) much as they are narrated in Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 5.5, and these served as a model for the Iliadic funeral games of Patroklos. Patroklos' funeral games an invention of the *Iliad*: Heubeck 1950: 29; Burgess 2001: 81–4.

²¹ Contrast Fenik 1968: 238: 'The funeral games for Pelias...are similar to those for Patroklos in the *Iliad*, and for Achilles in the *Aithiopis*.' Pelias' funeral games: Gantz 1993: 191–4.

²² Danek 1998a: 474: 'Die Angaben zur Beisetzung der Gebeine von Achilleus, Patroklos und Antilochos verraten deutlich, daß wir es mit der Kombination zweier konkurrierender Konzepte zu tun haben. Mit Antilochos und Patroklos sind zwei Figuren miteinander vereint, die in zwei unterschiedlichen Geschichten jeweils die Rolle von "Achills bestem Freund" einnehmen; dabei setzt die weitgehende Parallelität der Handlungen voraus, daß die beiden Geschichten als Alternativen zueinander konzipiert sind und sich in keine chronologische Abfolge bringen lassen.'

²³ For an **Amazonis* originally separate from the *Aethiopis*, see M. L. West 2013: 133.

²⁴ M. L. West 2003b: 9 = 2011b: 254. Cf. Fenik 1968: 149–50, 238.

²⁵ Fenik 1964: 8–9, following Kullmann, takes these figures to be pre-Homeric.

²⁶ Cf. Kullmann 1960: 224: 'Eine weitere Eigentümlichkeit der kyklischen Epen besteht darin, daß sie zahlreiche Motivdoubletten enthalten. Diese Eigenart erklärt sich ebenfalls durch die Verarbeitung verschiedener Sagenversionen zu einem einheitlichen Bilde.'

and Memnon (in the **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*)). On this view, the superfluity of Trojan champions may be at least in part the result of originally independent traditions, each with its own distinct hero(ine), being strung together in a continuous narrative sequence.

The Teuthranian campaign: the *Cypria* features two departures from Aulis (Summary, Bernabé pp. 40–1, lines 33, 42–3), each followed by an Achaean campaign in Asia (Teuthrania/Mysia; Troy) and each initiating an action lasting apparently ten years in total.²⁷ This striking duplication creates two further chronological inconcinnities. First, the duration of the whole war. If the Teuthranian campaign is ignored, then the whole war lasted ten years; this, evidently, is the assumption behind *Il.* 2.295–6, 2.329–30, 12.15, *Od.* 2.175–6, 14.240–2; compare Aesch. *Ag.* 40. However, if the Teuthranian campaign is acknowledged, then the whole war lasted twenty years; this appears to be the assumption behind *Il.* 24.765.²⁸ The second inconcinnity concerns the ages of Neoptolemos and of Penelope and Telemachos. The Teuthranian campaign is required if Neoptolemos is to be eighteen years old—rather than eight or nine—when he captures Troy.²⁹ But the Teuthranian campaign must be ignored if Telemachos is to be twenty years old (rather than thirty) and Penelope forty (rather than fifty), as the narrative of the *Odyssey* requires.³⁰ The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* each know the mythology of Neoptolemos and the Teuthranian campaign, which in fact seem intertwined with one another.³¹ There are grounds for considering the Teuthranian campaign an exclusionary doublet of the Trojan war.³² The one seems to be modelled on the other—apparently the former on the latter.³³ The Greeks mistake Teuthrania

²⁷ According to Pseudo-Apollodorus, ten years elapsed between Paris' abduction of Helene and the second muster at Aulis; these ten years comprised two years of preparations by the Achaeans, followed by eight years of the Teuthranian campaign itself and its aftermath (*Epit.* 3.18–19). The same chronology appears to be presupposed by Σ T *Il.* 9.668: Neoptolemos was eighteen years old in the twentieth, and final, year of the whole war. Neoptolemos will therefore have been fathered by Achilleus on Scyros two years after the abduction of Helene, in the final stages of the Achaean preparations. Compare and contrast Dio Chrys. 11.71–2: Agamemnon takes ten years mustering troops.

²⁸ Frazer 1921: 187 n. 4; Breslove 1943: 161; Kullmann 1960: 267; cf. Page 1961: 207–8. Differently explained by Reinhardt 1961: 485–90; Tsagalis 2008: 135–49.

²⁹ Σ T *Il.* 9.668: εἴκοσι δὲ ἔτη ἐστὶ πάσης τῆς παρασκευῆς τοῦ πολέμου, ὥστε δύναται ὁ Νεοπτόλεμος ὀκτωκαιδεκαέτης στρατεύειν. Kullmann 2005: 27. The alternatives are to assume either that the early Greek epic tradition admitted boy heroes or that it was simply indifferent to the ages of its main heroes; cf. M. L. West 2013: 184.

³⁰ Σ T *Il.* 19.326: οὐκ ἦσαν δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρπαγῆς Ἑλένης ἕως τῆς ἀλώσεως εἴκοσιν ἔτη· οὐκέτι γὰρ ἂν καιρὸν εἶχε γαμηθῆναι Πηνελόπην· καὶ Τηλέμαχος ἦν ἂν τριάκοντα ἐτῶν, παῖς... / νήπιος, οὔτε πόνων εὖ εἰδὼς οὔτ' ἀγοράων (δ 817–8) καὶ ἐπεὶ οὐ πω χερσὶ πέποιθα / ἄνδρ' ἀπαλέξασθαι (π 71–2). Contrast Σ T *Il.* 9.668.

³¹ Neoptolemos in Homer: *Il.* 19.326–33; cf. 24.467; *Od.* 11.519–21. The assumption of M. L. West 2001a: 12 (cf. 2011a: 359; 2011g: 412) that Neoptolemos is known to the *Odyssey* poet, but not the *Iliad* poet is still more problematic than the similar assumption for Memnon (see § 2.3, p. 60 n. 130): the latter relies on an argument from silence; the former must posit interpolation in the *Iliad*; cf. Kullmann 2005: 13. Teuthranian campaign in Homer: the adversarial pairing of Neoptolemos and Eurypylos at *Od.* 11.519–20 surely presupposes the antecedent adversarial pairing of Achilleus and Telephos in the Teuthranian campaign. The *Iliad*'s knowledge of the Teuthranian campaign: Kullmann 1960: 189–203; 2012b: 16–20.

³² Davies 2002: 12 and n. 28; cf. Howald 1946: 125.

³³ Differently, Howald 1946: 125–7.

for Troy (a → signal of dependence?), both campaigns last ten years, and both are inaugurated by a sacrifice on Aulis and concluded with the returning Greeks being dispersed by a storm.³⁴ It is unclear whether the Teuthranian campaign was ever a free-standing, synecdochic narrative.³⁵ If we suppose that it was, the foregoing argument would then imply that the early Greek epic (or mythological) tradition on the Trojan War developed in approximately the following stages. First, prior to the *Iliad*, the war between Greeks and Trojans would have been elevated into a ten-year conflict. Second, and still prior to the *Iliad*, the tradition of a ten-year Teuthranian campaign would have developed, conceived as an allusive, exclusionary doublet of the ten-year Trojan War. (The order of these two stages could be reversed.) Next would come the *Iliad*, a poem cognizant of both a ten-year Trojan War and, apparently, a ten-year Teuthranian campaign, though downplaying the latter.³⁶ Finally would come the *Odyssey*, a poem that elongated Odysseus' homecoming to ten years and begins its narrative in the tenth year of that homecoming in a pointed desire to model itself on the *Iliad*.³⁷ Yet if originally independent exclusionary doublets, the Trojan War and the Teuthranian campaign must have become interdependent second-generation inclusionary doublets at a quite early (pre-Homeric) stage, given that links of plot and theme between the two are found early on. Thus Telephos, after being wounded and healed by Achilles in the Teuthranian campaign, went on to guide the Greeks to Troy to fight the Trojan War (*Σ D Il.* 1.59 codd. AR; Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 3.20); Neoptolemos, conceived at the commencement of the Teuthranian campaign, is indispensable for the conclusion of the Trojan War (see above); and the non-fatal Achilles–Telephos combat in the Teuthranian campaign is answered by the fatal Neoptolemos–Eurypylos combat in the Trojan campaign (*Od.* 11.519–20; *Little Iliad* Summary Bernabé p. 74 lines 12–13; cf. Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 5.12).³⁸

Conclusions

It appears that the tradition was expanded piecemeal and locally, without excessive concern for how local innovations would affect the global, traditional picture.³⁹ We can see that a concern to synthesize is not confined to relatively late works like Pseudo-Apollodorus. The *Cypria* is concerned to synthesize existing narratives, and the 'Hesiodic' *Catalogue of Women* is another famously 'synthesizing' composition.⁴⁰ The *Odyssey*, too, is apparently concerned to synthesize: *Od.* 24.76–9 adds the Achilles–Patroklos relationship of the *Iliad* to the Achilles–Antilochos relationship

³⁴ Teuthrania mistaken for Troy: *Cypria*, Summary Bernabé p. 40 line 36; cf. also *Σ D Il.* 1.59; Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 3.17. Welcker 1849: 100 n. 18. Sacrifice at Aulis: Summary Bernabé p. 40 line 33 (Teuthranian campaign); Summary Bernabé p. 41 line 46 (Trojan War). Storm: *Little Iliad* fr. 24.1 Bernabé (Teuthranian campaign); *Od.* 3.131, *Nostoi* Summary Bernabé pp. 94–5 lines 12–13 (Trojan War).

³⁵ The possibility that the Teuthranian campaign was originally independent of the Trojan War: Carpenter 1946: 56–9; Howald 1946: 125–7; Dowden 1989: 206 n. 2. Differently, Kullmann 1960: 202: 'Ist eine solche Geschichte wie die teuthranische Expedition überhaupt außerhalb des Kyprienepos isoliert denkbar?.'

³⁶ Cf. *Σ T Il.* 1.59: τὰ γὰρ περὶ Μυσίαν ἀγνοεῖ.

³⁷ See § 2.2, p. 50 on the prolongation of Odysseus' homecoming to ten years in the *Odyssey*.

³⁸ M. L. West 2006: 16–17; Cingano 2010: 86–8.

³⁹ Cf. Macleod 1982: 154–5.

⁴⁰ M. L. West 1985: 30.

of the **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)*. And so too is the *Iliad* apparently concerned to synthesize: *Il.* 24.765 adds the ten-year Trojan war conception to a ten-year Teuthranian campaign conception. The synthesizing drive cannot be considered a sign of lateness, something that only happens with narratives of types (3), (4), and (5) above; it is a feature also of the early epics, and a marker of their conscious interaction with other poems or at least mythical traditions.

APPENDIX D

Pindar, the *Aethiopis*, and Homer

It is an important question how Pindar uses the *Aethiopis* and how reliably he may be used as indirect testimony to the lost epic. In general there can be little doubt that Pindar draws frequently on the archaic epics that were later incorporated into the Cycle, including the *Aethiopis*.¹ Thus (to be very selective) *P*.6.28–42 (discussed in this appendix) is generally taken to follow the *Aethiopis*' account of Antilochos' death; *I*.8.56a–60 (see § 4.4, p. 125) probably reflects Achilles' funeral as narrated in the *Aethiopis*; the motif of Thetis supplicating Zeus at *O*.2.79–80 may reflect the *Aethiopis* (see § 2.3, pp. 63–4). Other early non-Homeric epics are no less important to Pindar.² The mythical narrative of *N*.10, the fatal encounter between the Dioskouroi and Apharetidai, probably follows the *Cypria* closely.³ There are reflections of the *Thebais* and *Epigoni* in *O*.6, *P*.8, and *N*.9, as of the (Pseudo-)Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* in *P*.3 and *P*.9, and *Megalai Ehoiai* in, for instance, *I*.6.⁴ Pindar, unlike Bacchylides, seems to have a notable preference for non-Homeric archaic epic as sources of his mythological narratives.⁵ In this way, as in certain others, Pindar is seen to be a forerunner of, and model for, Callimachus.⁶ It is often tempting to suppose that Pindar follows those poems quite closely, and to take him as an indirect witness to the lost epics.⁷ But how faithful to the poems of the Cycle (or other early epic) is Pindar in general when he draws on them? Any answer is bound to be guesswork, of course.

In discussion of this problem, *P*.6.28–42, Pindar's narrative of Antilochos' death at Memnon's hands, takes pride of place. Pindar's narrative here is close to the Iliadic episode of 'Nestor in difficulty' (*Il.* 8.78–98). In both texts, Nestor is stranded after Paris has shot one of his horses, while Memnon (in *Pythian* 6) or Hektor (in *Iliad* VIII)

¹ Mann 1994; Burgess 2001: 45 and 208 n. 133; M. L. West 2011*d*: *passim*, esp. 60–2 on Pindar and the *Aethiopis*; 2013: 44–5; I. C. Rutherford 2015.

² Pindar as engaging with (epic) poetry, rather than just mythology: D'Alessio 2005*b*; M. L. West 2011*d*: 51 (on *P*.3.112–15).

³ Stoneman 1976: 229–32; I. C. Rutherford 2015: 457–9 (cautious).

⁴ *Thebais* and *Epigoni*: Stoneman 1981: 57; Braswell 1998: 28–30, but cf. 38–9. On *P*.8, contrast van 't Wout 2006 and M. L. West 2011*d*: 53, 60. (Pseudo-)Hesiod: D'Alessio 2005*b*: 232 n. 59, 234–5; D'Alessio 2005*a*: 192–5; M. L. West 2011*d*: 62–3.

⁵ Mann 1994, esp. 316; Bowra 1964: 283; A. D. Morrison 2007*b*: 124–5. The difference between Pindar and Bacchylides in this respect: A. D. Morrison 2007*b*: 125 n. 62; M. L. West 2013: 44–5; I. C. Rutherford 2015: 451–2. Bacchylides and Homer: D. L. Cairns 2010: 49–58. Sotiriou 1998: 129–50 frequently assumes Pindaric debts to Homer where these may rather be to non-Homeric epic; cf. R. L. Fowler 1987: 20–39. Pindar was probably able to distinguish 'Homeric' from 'Cyclical'/'non-Homeric' (Mann 1994: 324–5); his explicit references to 'Homer' probably intend the author of *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. Cf. *P*.4.277 (Braswell 1988: 378), *N*.7.21 (differently, M. L. West 2011*d*: 52), *I*.4.41; I. C. Rutherford 2015: 456–7.

⁶ Pindar and Callimachus: Newman 1967: 45–8; N. J. Richardson 1985; Cannatà Fera 1986: 85; Fuhrer 1988; 1992: 14–20; Hunter 1989: 17, 35.

⁷ Cf. I. C. Rutherford 2015: 459–60.

bears down on him threateningly. Pindar's narrative is often taken to derive from the *Aethiopis*.⁸ The similarity with the Homeric episode can then be explained neoanalytically by supposing that the *Iliad* alludes to this scene as it featured in a pre-Iliadic **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*, the Iliadic Hektor playing here the part of Memnon in the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*. This would not be the only place where the *Iliad* alludes to the death of Antilochos as told in the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*.⁹ This view of the relationship between the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*, *Iliad* VIII, and *Pythian* VI has often been regarded as a cornerstone of neoanalytical scholarship.¹⁰ It was challenged by A. Kelly, arguing, first, that the 'Nestor in difficulty' episode was not in the *Aethiopis* (either not at all or not in the form which Pindar gives it) and, second, that Pindar invented the scene of 'Nestor in difficulty' by combining various passages of the *Iliad*.¹¹ Pindar then emerges as (in this case) an unreliable witness to the *Aethiopis*.¹² Moreover, one of the more widely accepted arguments of neoanalysis would need to be abandoned and the neoanalytical case as a whole would be significantly weakened.¹³

We must first assess the likelihood that the scene of 'Nestor in difficulty' occurred in the *Aethiopis* in the context of Antilochos' death in something like the form that it takes in Pindar's ode.¹⁴ All details of the manner of Antilochos' death at the hands of Memnon are lacking from the brief mentions of this episode in the *Odyssey* (3.111–12, 4.187–8), the Summary of the *Aethiopis* (Bernabé p. 68 lines 11–12), and the Pseudo-Apollodoran *Library (Epitome* 5.3). Philostratus (*Heroicus* 26.18) and Quintus of Smyrna (7.49–50; cf. 2.243–5) at least specify that Archilochos died in the act of rescuing Nestor, although neither furnishes the significant detail of Nestor being detained by Paris shooting one of his horses that is common to *P.* 6.32–3 and *Il.* 8.81–8. Precisely that detail is supplied, however, indirectly, by Virgil's refiguration of the episode at *Aen.* 10.769–832. There, Lausus' self-sacrificial death for Mezentius, handicapped by his own injury and by Aeneas' spear fixed in his shield (*Aen.* 10.794–5), invites comparison with Antilochos' self-sacrificial death for Nestor, handicapped by Paris' arrow fixed in his horse (*P.* 6.32). Virgil here is likely to evoke the mythology of Antilochos' death; it is significant, and rather troubling, that Aeneas acts

⁸ And possibly the East Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi: Athanassaki 2012: 138–9.

⁹ Cf. *Il.* 16.317–24 (and 5.565–72). Kullmann 1960: 314; 1991: 442 = 1992: 117; 2005: 21–3 sees in those Iliadic passages inversions of **Memnonis (Aethiopis)*, and a happier outcome for the son of Nestor than awaits him in the other poetic tradition; cf. Reinhardt 1961: 356–7; Willcock 1973: 7.

¹⁰ Fraenkel 1932: 244–5; Kullmann 1960: 31–2; cf. 314; 2005: 17, 18, 23; Schadewaldt 1965 (1952): 159, 163; Willcock 1973: 6–7; 1978–84: i.262; 1983: 482–3; 1997: 179–80; M. W. Edwards 1991: 18; 2011: 566–7; Burgess 2009: 74 with references at 150 n. 5; Cook 2009: 137. Sceptically, Kirk 1990: 27, 304–5. Differently, M. L. West 2013: 146 takes the scene in the *Aethiopis* to depend on the scene of *Iliad* VIII, and Pindar to follow the *Aethiopis*; cf. Dihle 1970: 11–12; Erbse 1993: 397.

¹¹ Kelly 2006. Approved by, e.g., A. D. Morrison 2007b: 124–5 nn. 55, 58, 65; Allan 2008: 21 and n. 102. Critique: Heitsch 2008; Cook 2009; Barnes 2011: 4 n. 9; M. L. West 2013: 146 n. 28.

¹² Kelly 2006: 22.

¹³ Kelly's larger challenge to neoanalysis is emphasized by Heitsch 2008: 1–2.

¹⁴ The Pindar scholia do not say that the story of Antilochos' filial sacrifice was in the *Aethiopis* (cf. M. L. West 2013: 146, 147); indeed, they only ever mention the *Aethiopis* once (*Σ* Pind. I.4.58b; but cf. *Σ* O.2.148 οἱ τὰ μεθ' Ὀμηρον γράψαντες). (The *Cypria* is cited at *Σ* N.10.114a; *Little Iliad* at *Σ* N.6.85b; *Thebais* at *Σ* O.6.26; *Theseis* at *Σ* O.3.50b; *Titanomachia* at *Σ* N.3.40; *'Epicum adespoton'* at *Σ* O.9.70b.)

out the part of the unsympathetic Memnon and Lausus that of the sympathetic Antilochos. (The troubling note continues to sound with 812 *pietas tua* and 824 *patriae...pietatis imago*, said of Lausus, in poignant and ironic contrast with 826 *pious Aeneas* and 822 *Anchisiades*.)¹⁵ It is possible that Quintus was drawing, directly or indirectly, on the *Aethiopsis*.¹⁶ But it is a much more distinct possibility that the *Aethiopsis* is Virgil's model, direct or indirect, here. The *Aeneid* frequently alludes to material of the Epic Cycle.¹⁷ It does so in general terms at *Aen.* 1.456–93.¹⁸ In particular, Camilla in *Aeneid* XI is obviously modelled on the Penthesileia of the *Aethiopsis* (both 11.648 *Amazon* and 662 *Penthesilea* → signal the intertext).¹⁹ Virgil's presentation of the Lausus and the Camilla episodes in *Aeneid* X and XI respectively inverts the order in which the Penthesileia and Antilochos episodes occurred in the *Aethiopsis* (→ opposition in imitation; contrast 1.489–93, for the 'correct' sequencing).²⁰ Memnon himself is mentioned explicitly at *Aen.* 1.489 and implicitly at 8.384. It seems much more plausible to think that Virgil draws, directly or indirectly, on the *Aethiopsis* for Lausus' death than that he draws on Pindar's sixth *Pythian*.²¹ Pindaric allusions have little prominence in the *Aeneid*.²² Kelly cites E. Fraenkel for the view that there are in Virgil's narrative 'several direct reminiscences of Pindar's language'.²³ Fraenkel himself was concerned to argue that Virgil's narrative of Lausus' death depended closely on the *Aethiopsis*, that Pindar's narrative of Antilochos' death closely followed the *Aethiopsis*, and that Virgil's narrative resembled Pindar's only insofar as the latter was a 'reworking' (*Umstilisierung*) of the *Aethiopsis*.²⁴ Fraenkel did not argue for 'direct reminiscences' in Virgil of Pindar's language; he was interested, on the contrary, in using Pindar to demonstrate the likelihood of Virgil's dependence (direct or indirect) on the *Aethiopsis*.²⁵

It is strictly true that 'the precise manner of [Antilochos'] death in the *Aethiopsis* remains unknown'.²⁶ But it was well established in the classical period at any rate that Antilochos died while rescuing Nestor.²⁷ An entrenched mythological tradition in the fifth and fourth centuries is not likely to differ radically from the archaic Cyclical

¹⁵ Cf. S. J. Harrison 1991: 267, 268. Antilochos' devotion to his father: Xen. *Cyneg.* 1.14.

¹⁶ → Quintus and Epic Cycle. ¹⁷ → Virgil and Epic Cycle.

¹⁸ Barchiesi 1994: 117–18 = 1999: 333–4.

¹⁹ Camilla in *Aeneid* XI: Fraenkel 1932: 243; Fantuzzi 2014: 438; Gärtner 2015: 554–5. *Aen.* 11.648 as a 'signal': Horsfall 2003: 364 (who does not assume that Virgil used the *Aethiopsis* directly, 465–72).

²⁰ Ov. *AA* 3.1 may play with the way the Penthesileia episode of the *Aethiopsis* follows the death of Hektor in the *Iliad*: Gibson 2003: 86.

²¹ Fraenkel 1932: 247. Willcock 1983: 482–3 and 484–5 n. 7; 1997: 180; Kullmann 2015: 114. Differently, Kelly 2006: 13 n. 57; cf. Horsfall 2003: 466; Gärtner 2015: 557–8 and n. 55, 563.

²² Setaioli 1988; R. F. Thomas 1999. The strongest case is *Aen.* 3.570–82 (Favorinus in Gell. *NA* 17.10; but see Horsfall 2006: 394–5). The proem of the third *Georgic* may be a different matter: Balot 1998.

²³ Kelly 2006: 13 and n. 57. Cf. Fraenkel 1932: 247 'dem ἐμπέδα [Pind. *P*.6.32] kommt *inque ligatus* [Virg. *Aen.* 10.794] so nahe wie nur möglich'.

²⁴ Fraenkel 1932: 243, 244, 246. Hollis 2007: 125–6 supposes that Virgil's engagement with the *Aethiopsis* was mediated by an epyllion of M. Furius Bibaculus.

²⁵ Fraenkel 1932: 247–8.

²⁶ Kelly 2006: 13; cf. 23 n. 91. Willcock 1983: 482: 'we must admit that we do not precisely know how the tale was told in the *Aithiopsis*'.

²⁷ *P*.6.28–42; Xen. *Cyneg.* 1.14; [Aristot.] *fr.* 640 no. 11 Rose (epigram on Antilochos in the *Peplos*; for the classical date of these epigrams, see Gutzwiller 2010, esp. 225).

poem. We may assume, moreover, that a Nestor in urgent need of rescue found himself in mortal danger and that that mortal danger came upon 'horseman Nestor' (Γεῖνιος ἵπποτα Νέστωρ, probably an inherited formula; compare γέρων ἵππηλάτα Νέστωρ) in his chariot (compare Q.S. 2.302–3); in any case, this senior combatant is hardly to be thought of as getting around the battlefield on foot.²⁸

The 'Nestor in difficulty' motif is found in *Iliad* VIII, Pindar *Pythian* 6, and (refigured as 'Mezentius in difficulty') Virgil *Aeneid* 10.769–832. It is conceivable that Pindar inherited from the *Aethiopis* a traditional narrative of Antilochos' death without the 'Nestor in difficulty' motif and contaminated it with the 'Nestor in difficulty' motif of *Iliad* VIII, as Kelly suggests; here, as elsewhere, it is hard to gauge the likelihood and extent of Pindaric mythological invention.²⁹ But we should desiderate a motive for any putative Pindaric invention. In general the easiest motive to impute to the epinician poet is a desire to bring the mythological exemplum into line with the *hic et nunc*.³⁰ The application of the Antilochos paradigm to Thrasyboulos (made with unusual explicitness at P.6.44–5) has been variously explained.³¹ The simplest explanation is that Pindar extols his two *laudandi*, Xenokrates and Thrasyboulos, by presenting a mythical narrative that reflects their real-life situation with witty and hyperbolic exaggeration: Xenokrates is, implicitly, cast as 'charioteer' (though strictly the chariot *owner*), a second 'Nestor' rescued from 'death' (strictly, posthumous oblivion) by the filial devotion of Thrasyboulos, a second 'Antilochos', who by commissioning the epinician ensured that the memory of the athletic victory and of his victorious father will never die.³² Pindar's bold encomiastic rhetoric makes the drastic life-and-death situation of Antilochos and Nestor apply humorously to the less drastic real-life athletic situation of Thrasyboulos and Xenokrates.³³ That encomiastic rhetoric would be strained somewhat if the mythical paradigm itself had undergone

²⁸ ἵπποτα Νέστωρ: Quattordio Moreschini 1984; Kirk 1985: 151. Nestor and horses: Whallon 1969: 22–3. Nestor as ineffectual in battle: Erbse 1993: 391–2.

²⁹ Stoneman 1981: 51–2, 55; Willcock 1983: 482: 'We know that Pindar elsewhere modified accepted myths to suit his own purposes. Did he invent this death for Antilochos? The answer seems to be no.'

³⁰ Currie 2010: 229, 231. Other motives include a desire to rationalize a myth (see O.1.52; N.10.60, 61–2; I.6.37; Bacch. 11.59–60, with Currie 2010: 216–25) and a desire to incorporate local tradition (Stoneman 1981: 46–7 n. 12, 52, 57).

³¹ Gentili in Gentili et al. 1995: 184–5 assumes that Thrasyboulos drove the chariot for Xenokrates, but the assumption is not straightforward (contrast I.2.22: Nikomachos as Xenokrates' driver; and I.1.15: the victor explicitly identified as the driver). Gentili in Gentili et al. 1995: 185 discerns a further parallel between Antilochos (taught horsemanship by (Zeus and) Poseidon, *Il.* 23.306–7) and Thrasyboulos (devoted to Poseidon Hippios, P.6.51–2); but it is unclear that P.6 does anything to activate that particular intertext.

³² Thrasyboulos as responsible for the commission: A. D. Morrison 2007b: 43–4. Xenokrates may have been dead at the time when P.6 was commissioned, as with I.2 (note I.2.35–42; Asclepiades in Σ I.2 inscr. A). There is no especial reason to date P.6 to the year of Xenokrates' Pythian victory (twenty-fourth Pythiad, i.e. 494 or 490 BC); see, on the possibility of a later date, A. D. Morrison 2007b: 41 n. 3; and, in general for intervals between victories and the odes commemorating them, Currie 2005: 25; cf., on O.7, Currie 2011: 287 n. 75. Simonides also commemorated Xenokrates' Pythian and Isthmian victories, perhaps non-posthumously (fr. 513 PMG).

³³ Gentili in Gentili et al. 1995: 184 attempts to impart a literal drastic-heroic quality to Thrasyboulos' own situation by supposing that he drove the chariot himself at real personal risk.

bold manipulation before being thus boldly applied to the situation of the two *laudandi*. It would, moreover, be difficult to see the point of Pindar lifting from *Iliad* VIII a circumstantial detail of the impeding injured trace-horse which does not help to align the heroic myth with the *hic et nunc* and grafting it onto an account derived otherwise from the *Aethiopsis*. Finally, it is hard to see such a wilful Pindaric invention subsequently establishing itself in the mythological mainstream and displacing the version that was in the *Aethiopsis*.³⁴ In short, although it is guesswork that P.6.28–42 reflects faithfully and in detail the account of the *Aethiopsis*, it is probably the best guesswork we can hope for.³⁵

Numerous verbal parallels between Pindar's text and *Iliad* VIII and XXIII have been argued to show that the *Iliad* is a significant source for Pindar's mythical narration.³⁶ It is doubtful whether those parallels are sufficiently marked or meaningful to support that conclusion. Pindar's use of βόασε, in the sense of 'called out to for help' (P.6.36 βόασε παῖδα ὄν) is not very unusual (compare Archilochus' Telephos elegy, fr. 1.22 βοῶν ταλ[α]κάρδιον [υἱόν]; Bacch. 17.14–16 βόασέ τ' Ἐρίβοια.../...[Π]ανδίωνος / ἔκ[ρ]ονον), and there is little therefore to associate Pindar's βόασε specifically with either *Il.* 8.92 σμερδάλεον δ' ἐβόασεν (= *Od.* 8.305, 24.537) or *Il.* 8.91 βοῶν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης, which are quite different uses.³⁷ The νόημα of P.6.29 is quite unlike the νόησε of the Iliadic 'Nestor in difficulty' episode (*Il.* 8.91 εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὄξυ νόησε, 'if he hadn't noticed sharply': a formula).³⁸ Pindar's phrase varies the common Pindaric idea that someone (here a mythical hero, elsewhere the *laudandus*) has displayed the quality of mind (νόημα) that the gnomic or mythical section of the ode exhorts.³⁹ It is also hard to see the application of the (non-epic, but very Pindaric) epithet βιατάς, 'strong, powerful', to Antilochos at P.6.29 as motivated by any of *Il.* 8.103 βίη (of Nestor) or 23.576 βιησάμενος and 23.578 βίη (of Menelaos).⁴⁰ P.6.39 κοιμῶν πατρός, 'the safe return of his father', seems unlikely to recall Iliadic uses (23.411, 8.186) of κοιμῶν in the very different

³⁴ Kelly 2006: 21–2 claims P.9 as a parallel. However, it is unclear whether Pindar in P.9 combined a 'Hesiodic' Kyrene-*ehoie* with the Iliadic *Dios apate* (cf. Instone 1996: 128). Further, Pindar may not have invented the link between the Thessalian Kyrene and Libyan Cyrene: it could already have been in 'Hesiod' or local Cyrenean tradition (R. L. Fowler 2013: 149 with n. 92; cf. M. L. West 1985: 86 n. 125; Gentili in Gentili et al. 1995: 233–4 n. 6; Giangiulio 2001: 122–3; D'Alessio 2005a: 206. Finally, Pindar's innovation, if that is what it was, did not enter the mythological mainstream: the authors who reflect it are, tellingly, a mythographer (Pherecydes fr. 58 EGM), a local historian of Cyrene (Acesander *On Cyrene FGrH* = BNJ 469 F4), and an Alexandrian poet from Cyrene notably receptive to influence from both local history and Pindar (Callim. *Hy.* 2.91; Kuiper 1896–8: ii. 140–1; Pfeiffer 1949–53: ii.137 'Index rerum notabilium', s.v. 'Pind.'; A. D. Morrison 2007a: 353 'General Index' s.v. 'Callimachus, and Pindar').

³⁵ A. D. Morrison 2007b: 45: 'The Pindaric version, while compressed, does not appear to innovate or vary in the main points from the usual version of the myth.'

³⁶ Kelly 2006: 18: 'powerful series of parallels'; 2 'Pindar is heavily influenced by the *Iliad*.'

³⁷ Pace Kelly 2006: 14–15 with n. 63. This use of βοῶν: Fraenkel 1950: ii. 29–30.

³⁸ Contrast Kelly 2006: 15.

³⁹ P.6.29 νόημα means 'thought', 'way of thinking' (cf. Nisetich 1980: 197: 'And long ago Antilochos the warrior / proved himself of such a mind': italics added), rather than, with Kelly 2006: 18, Antilochos' 'intent'. The rhetorical (though not grammatical) structure of P.6.28–30 may be compared with P.8.38, O.6.12–14.

⁴⁰ Pace Kelly 2006: 16. βιατάς in Pindar: Slater 1969: 92; cf. Hutchinson 2001: 81: 'absent from epic'.

sense of ‘maintenance’, ‘upkeep’ of horses.⁴¹ Lastly, comparison of *P.6.32 Νεστόρ-ειον* with *Il. 8.113 Νεστορέας* and *192 Νεστορέην* shows little.⁴²

The similarities between *P.6* and *Iliad* VIII that are most telling are on the level of motif rather than of phrasing. But there is also a wholly unverifiable possibility that some of Pindar’s language goes back to the *Aethiopis*. (One other possible case of Pindar reusing lines from early epic is *O.6.17*.)⁴³ In particular Pindar’s use of the verb μένειν (*P.6.31 ἀναμείνας*, *38 μένων*) has been argued to derive from the Cyclical poem.⁴⁴ Whereas Kelly argued that *P.6.28–42* drew its phrasing from *Iliad* VIII (and XXIII), and likewise M. Sotiriou that *I.8.56a–60* drew its phrasing from *Od. 24.58–73* (the description of Achilles’ funeral), it is easier to think that a debt, if any, is owed to the *Aethiopis* than to the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* respectively.⁴⁵ That scenario would presuppose that the phrasing of the passages of *Iliad* VIII and *Odyssey* XXIV was close to that of the passages of **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) to which they alluded, that the phrasing of *Aethiopis* (if indeed distinct from **Memnonis*) was close to the **Memnonis*, and that the phrasing of Pindar was close to the *Aethiopis*.⁴⁶ To this scenario Kelly objects, ‘[c]opying of the required sort is only really possible from a written text’; ‘[the argument] would have to assume what it seeks to prove, viz. that there were fixed written texts on which Homer was consciously drawing’.⁴⁷ But there are a number of reasons for thinking that Homer was capable of drawing on fixed (but not necessarily written) texts.⁴⁸

To summarize: Pindar drew far less frequently for his myths on the two Homeric epics than on the Epic Cycle or the Hesiodic *Catalogue* and *Megalai Ehoiai*. There is no convincing reason to think that in *Pythian* 6 Pindar has made a persiflage out of several unconnected Iliadic passages.⁴⁹ The alternative is to assume that Pindar followed the *Aethiopis* here, as elsewhere. In that case, *Iliad* VIII and the *Aethiopis* featured very similar scenes of Hektor and Memnon respectively bearing down on an impeded Nestor. One of those two scenes is then likely to have been modelled on the other.⁵⁰ Then there is the question of direction of influence. That question is generally resolved into the question which of the two is the ‘better motivated’ within its

⁴¹ Pace Kelly 2006: 16.

⁴² Such Pindaric adjectives formed from personal names are commoner than Kelly 2006: 17 n. 69 suggests; cf. *P.2.18 Δεινομένειος*, *N.6.41 Ποσειδάιος*, *I.4.53 Ώαριώνειος*, *I.6.29 Λαομεδόντειος*.

⁴³ On *O.6.17*, see Hutchinson 2001: 381–2; cf. Torres-Guerra 1995: 39–40; Braswell 1998: 28–9; Currie 2010: 217–18 and n. 28; M. L. West 2011d: 53; I. C. Rutherford 2015: 452–3. Compare ⇒ *P.1.16–17* (Mess 1901: 173).

⁴⁴ Mühlestein 1969: 90 = 1987: 51. Cf. 89 = 50: ‘Pindar scheint recht genau dem Wortlaut der *Aithiopis* verpflichtet, wie schon Homer sie kannte’; Fraenkel 1932: 244; Burton 1962: 22.

⁴⁵ Sotiriou 1998: 242–3. Similarly, Young 1968: 55 n. 3; but differently, Mann 1994: 315–16, with n. 12.

⁴⁶ See § 5.7 for a similar scenario.

⁴⁷ Kelly 2006: 23.

⁴⁸ → Fixed texts.

⁴⁹ Kelly 2006: 17: ‘The myth of *Pythian* 6 appears to be a concentrated and deliberate recomposition of the Θ and Ψ episodes.’

⁵⁰ Fenik 1968: 233–4, 237; Burgess 2009: 74 (cautiously). Differently, Turkeltaub 2005: 136 n. 25, arguing for ‘a “son-dies-for-father” motif that predates both Antilochus and Diomedes’. The typological explanation here is questionable for reasons familiar to the reader of this book. This motif is attested only in two contexts (*Iliad* VIII and *Aethiopis*) and is strikingly character-specific (the endangered father = Nestor; the aggressor = Hektor or Memnon, an allusive doublet of Hektor). On this evidence, the inference of a ‘transferred motif’ is more justified than the typological explanation.

immediate narrative context or which is ‘more consequential’ for the plot, and generally answered in favour of the *Aethiopsis* scene.⁵¹ We might also ask, more simply: which of the two was the more likely to inspire imitation or allusion by the other? The position taken on this question will depend on one’s general view of the *Iliad*’s manner of allusion and of the relationship between the *Iliad* and the Cyclical epics—issues explored throughout this book. It is one of the most widely accepted arguments of neoanalysis that the narrative of *Iliad* XVI–XXII has transferred the traditional role of Memnon from a **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) to Hektor (see § 2.3). Congruently, in this scene of *Iliad* VIII, Hektor is seen to play the part of Memnon: this scene of *Iliad* VIII thus appears to be part of the wider Iliadic strategy of adapting the motifs of a **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*). A final further argument for the motival priority of the *Aethiopsis* scene over the Iliadic may be mentioned: the ‘Nestor in difficulty’ / ‘death of Antilochos’ motif is found scattered in various parts of the *Iliad* (16.317–24, 5.565–72, as well as 8.78–98), which it is easier to see as Iliadic refractions of an integral original motif from a **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) than it is to think that the *Aethiopsis* reconstituted a continuous narrative of Nestor, Memnon, and Antilochos out of those *disiecta membra*.⁵²

⁵¹ Schadewaldt 1965 (1951): 163: ‘Die Not des Alten drängt auf Größeres als glatte Übernahme auf den anderen Wagen.—“Entwertung” des Motivs, Verwandlung einer heldischen Demonstration der Sohnestreue in ein beiläufiges Kampfgenre...Eine Umkehrung der Verhältnisse ist nicht denkbar.’ Willcock 1983: 482. → Inconsequentiality.

⁵² Kullmann 1991: 442 = 1992: 117–18; cf. 1977: 533 = 1992: 203.

APPENDIX E

Prospective Lamentation

This appendix returns to the Andomache–Hektor scene of *Iliad* VI and the Thetis–Achilleus scene of *Iliad* XVIII that form the backbone of Chapter 4.¹ Both scenes have recently been treated from a contrasting standpoint by A. Kelly.² His argument that ‘prospective lamentation’ is a ‘typical sequence’ in Homeric epic cuts against the argument of that chapter that the highly charged weeping of the female characters in those scenes serves to direct the attention of the audience towards scenes in other poetry where the lamentation was more obviously and directly called for. Kelly’s article also contests an argument fundamental to neoanalysis that the scene of Thetis and the Nereids mourning with Achilleus in *Iliad* XVIII alludes to a scene of Achilleus’ funeral from earlier epic poetry.³ As well as challenging another cornerstone of neoanalysis, therefore, Kelly’s arguments raise issues of evidence and method very germane to this book.⁴

Two clarifications of a general sort are in order. First, even if it were established that ‘prospective lamentation’ were a type-scene, this would not itself undermine the neoanalytical argument that the scene of *Iliad* XVIII alludes to a scene from earlier poetry (**Memnonis (Aethiopsis)*): one (marked) use of a type-scene may allude to another.⁵ Second, it should not be supposed that positing an inherited type-scene of ‘prospective lamentation’ is equivalent to ‘explaining the text on its own terms’, whereas the neoanalytical approach has recourse to something outside the text.⁶ Rather, to posit a type-scene or a formula ‘must always represent a leap into the dark, into the poet’s mind’.⁷ This appendix will argue that, whereas the grounds for inferring the existence in pre-Homeric poetry of a scene of Thetis and Nereids mourning Achilleus are about as strong as they could be (see § 4.4), the grounds for inferring a type-scene of ‘prospective lamentation’ are relatively weak: this constitutes therefore more of a leap into the dark.

First, there are a priori difficulties with positing a type-scene or typical sequence of ‘prospective lamentation’. Prospective lamentation is not an everyday act, one of ‘the obvious repeated situations in the poems, such things as arrivals and departures,

¹ See §§ 4.3, 4.4.

² Kelly 2012.

³ See §§ 2.3, 4.4.

⁴ Kelly 2012: 222: ‘an episode usually regarded as one of the oldest and most central planks of Neoanalysis’; cf. Clay 2013: 106: ‘Adrian Kelly attacks the very foundation of Neo-Analysis.’ Kelly’s challenge to neoanalysis is approved by Martin 2013; Matijević 2013: 45, 46, 50. See Appendix D for another challenge of Kelly to a key neoanalytical argument.

⁵ Cf. Kullmann 1984: 314–15 and n. 17 = 1992: 147, citing Fenik 1968: 237: ‘Typical composition and direct influence are not incompatible.’ → Allusion via typical elements.

⁶ Quotation from Kelly 2012: 264. See rather 222: ‘both schools [Oralist and Neoanalyst] concentrate on the semantic potential of factors external to the text itself’. Both traditional referentiality and neoanalysis as having recourse to text-external features: Danek 2005a: 5–6.

⁷ Hainsworth 1993: 6.

armings, sending of messages, and incidents in the fighting'.⁸ A type-scene of 'prospective lamentation' must be premised on the existence of a type-scene of 'lament'.⁹ But one might then expect a narrative requiring an unseasonable or premature lament simply to draw on the existing type-scene of 'lament', rather than calling into being a whole new typical sequence of 'prospective lamentation' with its own distinctive *Gestalt*.¹⁰ That is the approach of J. M. Foley, whose analysis of the Andromache scene of *Iliad* VI appeals only to a type-scene of 'lament'. Thus Andromache's lament in book VI is seen as a 'proto-lament', her laments in books XXII and XXIV as 'real laments', but all are encompassed under a single 'Lament *sêma*'.¹¹ If Homeric scenes of 'proleptic weeping' are found to have a striking cohesion, that does not in itself show them to be a typical sequence. The next paragraph will argue that their cohesion can be very differently explained: as a series of specific reprises.

As a distinct type-scene of 'prospective lamentation' is a priori counterintuitive, the case for its existence depends on a posteriori argumentation, on the evidence of the texts. Kelly adduces eight instances of his 'typical sequence' of 'prospective lamentation' in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, discerning a 'basic pattern' consisting in a 'two-stage process' in which a more public lament is followed by a more private lament; in addition, we find that a prematurely grieving female often suffers a 'rebuff' from a male.¹² According to Kelly, '[t]hough this is not a typical scene in the same sense as the famous arming scenes, there is a consistent sequence across the examples, next to which the variations gain their meaning and significance'.¹³ However, the 'two-stage' pattern does not clearly emerge in 37.5 per cent of the cases (Kelly's nos 1, 3, and 4, all from the *Iliad*: 4.148–82, 18.35–145, 24.191–328); these therefore can offer no support for the posited 'typical sequence'.¹⁴ The pattern must be established, if anywhere, from the other cases (*Il.* 6.319–502; *Od.* 1.328–64, 4.679–758, 19.53–604, and 21.55–358). Here, there is indeed a pattern, but it is one that can be very doubtfully attributed to the operation of a type-scene. In all but one (i.e. 50 per cent of cases: Kelly's nos 5–8), we are concerned with a single character in (virtually) the same situation: Penelope in the

⁸ Willcock 1990: 2; cf. de Jong 2001: xix. Contrast Gainsford 2003: 41 n. 3.

⁹ Haussker 2011: 455 distinguishes three types of 'lament' involving a solo dirge by the chief mourner, which is given in direct speech: (1) lament 'over the expected dead' (compare and contrast Kelly's 'prospective lamentation'); (2) lament on the discovery of the death; (3) lament at the *prothesis*. See M. W. Edwards 1992: 318; Alexiou 2002: 131–2; Tsagalis 2004; Gagliardi 2006a: 189–94; Gagliardi 2006b.

¹⁰ Finkelberg 2004: 247: 'just as it makes sense in terms of formulaic economy to have formulae and formulaic systems for any frequently recurring idea and standard narrative situation, so it equally makes sense not to overload the poet's memory in the case of ideas and situations that do not fall into this category, leaving room for the creation of individual expressions instead'.

¹¹ J. M. Foley 1999: 189, 193, 199.

¹² Kelly 2012: 230, 264–5; cf. 246.

¹³ Kelly 2012: 245.

¹⁴ Kelly 2012: 230 makes a virtue of this difficulty, stressing 'flexibility'; cf. 235: 'Of course, this scene [no. 1] is not completely analogous to the first two examples'; 241: 'These last three examples show us how flexible the poet can be in adapting the sequence to particular narrative requirements, but the most untypical is [no. 4] ... its unique qualities actually serve to show how typical and established is the usual sequence'; 247 '(almost) unique variation, yet we have already seen the poet do much more adventurous things with the pattern'.

Odyssey weeping either for Odysseus (1.328–64, 19.53–604, 21.55–358) or for Telemachos (4.679–758).¹⁵ In the one remaining case from the *Iliad*, Andromache weeps for Hektor (Kelly's no. 2: *Il.* 6.319–502). The four Odyssean cases are obviously thematically related; even Penelope's weeping for Telemachos can be seen as a doublet of her weeping for Odysseus (signalled: $\Rightarrow$ *Od.* 4.724–7... $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\acute{o}\sigma\iota\nu \dots \nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu \delta' \alpha\acute{\upsilon} \pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta'$...).¹⁶ Rather than a typical scene, therefore, it is much more likely that we have here a specific motif, repeated and varied within the *Odyssey*.¹⁷ These scenes are too highly character- and situation-specific to be assumed to be independently generated instances of a typical schema.¹⁸ That conclusion is reinforced when the verbatim repetitions are considered.¹⁹ A block of nine lines is common to Kelly's nos 5 and 8 (*Od.* 1.356–64 = 21.350–8, with only 21.352 $\tau\acute{o}\xi\omicron\nu$ substituted for 1.358 $\mu\upsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma$).²⁰ This type of repetition is unlike the repetition of purely generic lines in type-scenes of, for instance, sacrificing or feasting. Verbal repetition is otherwise wholly absent from the postulated type-scene of 'prospective lamentation'. Such verbatim repetition, coupled with the character- and situation-specificity, seriously problematizes the attempt at a typological explanation. The four Odyssean instances (nos 5–8) are plausibly seen as a specific motif reprised repeatedly throughout the poem; the remaining Iliadic case (no. 2) should also be recognized as belonging in (and initiating) this sequence.²¹ In Chapter 6 it was argued that the first Odyssean instance of Telemachos 'rebuffing' Penelope at $\Rightarrow$ *Od.* 1.328–64 (no. 5) alludes to *Il.* 6.319–502 (no. 2), where Hektor 'rebuffs' Andromache.²² That intertextual allusion of *Odyssey* I to *Iliad* VI gives rise further to a sequence of specific intratextual allusions in *Odyssey* I, XIX, and XXI.²³ Kelly's 'two-stage process', whereby a prematurely lamenting woman passed from a (more) public to a (more) private location, and the woman's rebuff, then emerges as the result of Odyssean *imitatio* of the *Iliad*, and the conformity between Kelly's nos 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 as the result of specific reprises, not a typical sequence.²⁴ It should also be noted that an argument for Kelly's nos 1 and 2 being a specific reprise has also been repeatedly made; crucial is again the

¹⁵ Cf. Mueller 2009: 156, on 'name associations', which 'raise doubts about the idiomatic [sc. formulaic] status of a phrase and provide evidence for the alternate hypothesis that two passages are interdependent in specific ways'; *ibid.* 165.

¹⁶ See § 4.5, p. 128.

¹⁷ See esp. Schwabl 1982: 16, with 16–17 n. 9; cf. R. B. Rutherford 1985: 136–7; 1992: 199.

¹⁸ $\rightarrow$ Character specific elements.

¹⁹ The repeated phraseology is noted by Kelly 2012: 236 and n. 43, drawing attention especially to *Od.* 19.602–4 = 1.362–4 = 21.356–8. See esp. R. B. Rutherford 1985: 137: 'The pattern is... made clearer by the repetition of "formulaic" lines', with *ibid.* 147 n. 20: 'The term "formulaic" covers an important ambiguity... Does fixed repetition of lines imply that they are simply part of the tradition, or has the poet himself *invented* formulae which are suited to his needs and convey part of his message?'

²⁰ $\rightarrow$ Block formula.

²¹ See Schwabl 1982: 17 n. 9.

²² See Chapter 6, pp. 224–6.

²³ For 'intratextual' relations between the laments of the *Iliad*, esp. Andromache's 'laments' in books VI, XXII, XXIV, see Tsagalis 2004: 109–65; cf. Di Benedetto 1994: 289–97.

²⁴ In general, Di Benedetto 1994: ix: 'Soprattutto quando si tratta di espressioni che non coinvolgono nozioni tipiche si può trattare del fatto che il poeta ripettesse un segmento di testo che era stato lui stesso a creare e che lui stesso era portato a ripetere per un fenomeno—anche inconscio—di persistenza della memoria poetica.' Cf. Mueller 2009: 156–62.

identity of the verses *Il.* 4.163–5 = 6.447–9.²⁵ These may all be recognized as cases where, in D. Lohmann's words, 'the parallels reside in the poetic construction, not in the taking over of any pre-formed subject-matter, much less of fixed formulae'.²⁶

²⁵ Di Benedetto 1994: 184–7; Dowden 1996: 59–60, instancing *Il.* 4.163–5 = 6.447–9 as a particularly strong illustration of 'how far repetitions in the text of the *Iliad* are meant to remind us of their earlier occurrences'; Mueller 2009: 171, 177.

²⁶ Lohmann 1988: 39 (translated). Cf. Reinhardt 1961: 15–16.

APPENDIX F

Typologically Generated Repetition versus Specific Reprise

How do we recognize when we are dealing with a typologically generated repetition or a specific reprise?¹ The question is both fundamental and recurrent, in scholarship generally and in this book. Often, with great difficulty; yet it is easy enough to indicate the considerations that may tip interpreters to one view or the other. This appendix will attempt to do this through an illustrative example, one involving intratextuality rather than intertextuality.

In a simile at *Odyssey* 5.394–7 Odysseus regaining land is compared to a father being restored to his children; in another simile at *Odyssey* 23.233–8 Penelope recovering her husband and the head of her household is compared to men regaining land after shipwreck. For O. Taplin, we have here '[o]ne of the clearest cross-allusions in all Homer'.² According to J. B. Hainsworth, on the other hand, commenting on the book V simile, 'the association of rescue at sea with family reunion is probably traditional, for the two recur at xxiii 233–8'.³ For Hainsworth, the simile's recurrence creates a presumption that it is traditional (even though we are dealing with a singular recurrence). In such cases it is often understood that it would be mistaken to look for → meaningfulness in the recurrence.⁴ Hainsworth makes that explicit with another simile, repeated verbatim, in which Athene's action of beautifying Odysseus as he appears successively to Nausikaa and Penelope is compared to the action of a goldsmith (*Od.* 6.232–35 = 23.159–62).⁵

How are we to arbitrate between these conflicting positions, formulated by two scholars at the same university within two years of each other? It depends partly, of course, on our estimation of how much, in general, is traditional in the Homeric poems.⁶ For a given simile it is not easy to ascertain whether the image employed is

¹ Cf. Schwabl 1990: 66: 'Typusanalogie' or 'Zitat'/'motivischer Zusammenhang'; Mueller 2011: 741–2: 'idiomatic repetition' or 'interdependent repetition'; J. M. Foley† and Arft 2015: 84: 'recurrence' versus 'repetition'.

² Taplin 1990: 110.

³ Hainsworth 1988: 284.

⁴ Cf. M. Parry 1971: 407, on 'finding falsely subtle meanings in the repetitions, as meant to recall an earlier scene where the same words are used'. Critiqued: R. B. Rutherford 1992: 56–7 with n. 74; Di Benedetto 1994: 105–6.

⁵ Hainsworth 1988: 308: 'The modern reader, who is trained in such matters, will probably recall the present use, with Nausicaa's reaction, on reading the second...However, the Homeric audience were too thoroughly accustomed to repetition for any particular instance to have been significant to them; the repetition cannot have been conscious.' Critiqued: Austin 1991: 234–5.

⁶ Bakker 1988: 153: 'Nobody denies that Homer is full of formulas. But on the question how full there is no agreement.' Note Hainsworth 1970: 90–1: 'the oral poem is very traditional. Perhaps, if we understood the singer's skill perfectly, we might wish to say that it was wholly traditional'; differently, Di Benedetto 1994: 106–7; Finkelberg 2012: 83.

traditional.⁷ Yet extended similes are rarely repeated verbatim in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (eight similes out of a total of approximately 180), and when they are, it is unlikely to be due to the happenstance of tradition. Specific reprise is a distinct possibility for the simile repeated verbatim at *Od.* 6.232–5 = 23.159–62, as also for other similes repeated verbatim in the two poems.⁸

The similes repeated at *Od.* 5.394–7 and 23.233–8 are not repeated verbatim, although there are striking verbal similarities between them (notably, forms of the adjective *ἀσπαστός* occur three times in each).⁹ We lack the evidence to say whether or not this image is a traditional one.¹⁰ Yet regardless of whether or not the ‘rescue at sea’ and ‘family reunion’ pairing is traditional, there is reason to think that this recurrence is not due just to the workings of tradition.¹¹ The two contexts in which the simile is deployed are not just casually linked. They punctuate crucial stages in Odysseus’ homecoming.¹² Odysseus reaching Scheria marks the end of the hero’s wanderings and connotes his return to Ithaca; Penelope folding Odysseus in her embrace is the true homecoming. The manner of the association between rescue at sea and family reunion is exactly reversed in the two passages. In the first, rescue at sea is the tenor and family reunion the vehicle; in the second, family reunion is the tenor and rescue at sea is the vehicle (→ *Umkehr in Wiederkehr*).¹³ The assumption of a thematic connection between the two passages makes excellent sense. Penelope is thereby assimilated to Odysseus.¹⁴ She, too, has had her ‘Odyssey’.¹⁵ These linked similes may be seen alongside other intratextualities in the *Odyssey* connecting Odysseus on Scheria with Odysseus on Ithaca.¹⁶ The simile of the goldsmith that is repeated

⁷ Homeric similes as drawing on traditional or typical images: Fränkel 1921: 107 = 1997: 114–15; Krischer 1971: 15–17 and *passim*; Danek 2006a: 45; Scott 2009: 17, 19, 25. Differently, cf. M. W. Edwards 1987a: 102–3; 1991: 34; cf. 38.

⁸ *Od.* 6.232–5 = 23.159–62 (Beye 1984: 9; differently, J. M. Foley 1990: 254); *Il.* 9.14–15 = 16.3–4 (J. Griffin 1995: 77; differently, Hainsworth 1993: 61); *Il.* 6.506–11 = 15.263–8 (Di Benedetto 1994: 149, 150; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 226). In general, Beye 1984: *passim*, esp. 7–8; see also Russo 1968: 287–8; Garvie 1994: 12, 139–40, 180; M. W. Edwards 1991: 24 n. 29. Differently, Scott 1974: 139: ‘in repeating simile units there is no reminiscence’.

⁹ Moulton 1977: 128–9; Danek 2006a: 61–2 and n. 37. Cf. Ps.-Hes. *Sc.* 42–5 (taken by Ormand 2014: 174 to reprise the Odyssean passages).

¹⁰ The three-way association of homecoming, rescue, and convalescence is argued to be traditional by Fränkel 1921: 95; Frame 1978: 125–52.

¹¹ See esp. Danek 2006a: 58; cf. Podlecki 1971: 88–90; Moulton 1977: 128–30; Friedrich 1981: 133–7; R. B. Rutherford 1986: 160 and n. 77 = 2009: 182 n. 79; 1992: 37 n. 32; 2013: 126; H. P. Foley 2009 (1978): 189.

¹² Danek 2006a: 58.

¹³ Friedrich 1981: 135. ‘Reverse similes’: H. P. Foley 2009 (1978): 189–90.

¹⁴ De Jong 2001: 559. We may wish to say that with this inversion Penelope effectively trumps Odysseus, as she does also in the ‘recognition’ (*Od.* 23.177–230), where she tests Odysseus rather than vice versa with a dissembling speech. Compare the inversion of the bathing-and-seduction motif at ⇒ *Od.* 23.111–16, 153–72; see § 5.14, pp. 189–91. Similarly, Penelope’s *κλέος*, not Odysseus’, takes the limelight at *Od.* 24.196–8, in a self-conscious projection of the *Odyssey* itself, contrasting with the *Odyssey* that Odysseus himself perhaps envisaged (cf. *Od.* 9.19–20): Finley 1978: 3: ‘That comes near making our *Odyseia* a *Penelopeia*.’

¹⁵ Podlecki 1971: 90; H. P. Foley 2009 (1978): 189; J. Griffin 1987a: 58; J. V. Morrison 2005: 79.

¹⁶ R. B. Rutherford 1985: 140–1; Garvie 1994: 15 and n. 47; Burgess 2006a: 157 and n. 23. Sceptically, Hainsworth 1988: 359 (critiqued: Loudon 1999: xiii).

verbatim also links the Scherian and Ithacan narratives, specifically linking Nausikaa and Penelope.¹⁷ As a long-range allusion spanning nearly the whole epic, the linked similes at *Od.* 5.394–7 and 23.233–8 would have an Iliadic parallel in the repeated and reversed ‘man and snake’ similes applied to Paris and Menelaos and then to Hektor and Achilleus at *Il.* 3.33–7 and 22.93–7 respectively.¹⁸ As with the Scherian and Ithacan narratives of the *Odyssey*, these linked Iliadic similes may also be seen against the background of broader similarities and reversals between *Iliad* III and *Iliad* XXII.¹⁹ (Similes, in fact, may be especially well suited to point up both intratextuality and intertextuality.)²⁰ So the question, ‘Typologically generated repetition or specific reprise?’ can reasonably be answered in this case: ‘Probably a specific reprise—regardless of whether the image is drawn from a common stock.’

Our discussion of this example suggests some general observations. First, the decision between a typologically generated repetition or a specific reprise is not clinched by the demonstration, even when it can be made, that the repetition involves a typical or traditional element. We may perfectly well have a specific reprise of a typical or traditional element.²¹ In some cases (our illustrative example is one), it may be easier to decide that we have a specific reprise than it is to decide whether or not we have a typical element.

Second, a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach is always needed. The choice between a typologically generated repetition and a specific reprise cannot reliably be made by counting occurrences, whether two or twenty.²² The qualitative approach will involve a judgement whether the passages are → marked (in their position in the poem, through their use of striking diction or other shared formal features) and whether it may make sense to see a → meaningful dialogue between the two (or more) contexts.

Third, a judgement in favour of a specific reprise may or may not entail seeing a hierarchical relationship between the passages. There is no need in this example to think in terms of → motivational priority: the book V simile can anticipate the book XXIII simile as much as the book XXIII simile can recall the book V simile.²³ However, there are good grounds in general for thinking that in the *Odyssey* as in the *Iliad* ‘the narrative flows in a single direction’, that ‘often one can identify a very precise line

¹⁷ De Jong 2001: 555. ¹⁸ N. J. Richardson 1993: 116; de Jong 2012: 81.

¹⁹ Lohmann 1988: 59–62; N. J. Richardson 1993: 8–9. Long-range cross-references in Homeric epic: R. B. Rutherford 1992: 56; Hainsworth 1993: 20; Di Benedetto 1994: ix, 177–238; Reichel 1994: *passim*; Janko 1998a: 9–10; Barnes 2011: 2–3; de Jong 2012: 14.

²⁰ Garner 1990: *passim*; Korenjak 1998: 136 and n. 17; De Jong 2012: 25. Cf., on *Od.* 21.406–8, R. B. Rutherford 1985: 142–3. On *Il.* 12.299–308 and *Od.* 6.130–6, Friedrich 1981: 122–4; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 139–40. Simile and intertextuality in Bacchylides (Bacch. 13.121–40 and *Il.* 15.624–9, with opposition in imitation): D. L. Cairns 2010: 52–5, 307–10; Most 2012: 256–9. In Virgil: Farrell 1997: 232 (*Aen.* 5.144–7), R. F. Thomas 1988: 84 (*Geo.* 1.104–10, and other examples, involving opposition in imitation).

²¹ → Allusion via typical elements.

²² Schwabl 1982: 17: ‘Was man aber sehen muß, ist, daß die bloß statistische Feststellung der Wiederholung die Traditionalität gerade nicht erweisen kann’; cf. 27–8. Compare and contrast Burgess 2006a: 157; Mueller 2009: 142. → Frequency of motif.

²³ Friedrich 1981: 136. In general, Lohmann 1970: 187, 202–9; 1988: 44. Janko 1992: 256 (on the repeated simile *Il.* 6.506–11 = 15.263–8): ‘Neither context is “original”.’ Compare Appendix C on simultaneously conceived inclusionary doublets (p. 239).

of development'.²⁴ And in other cases, especially of argued transference between texts ('intertextuality'), → direction of influence may be of critical importance.²⁵

Fourth, this example involves an argument for specific allusion within a single poem, but the issues are similar with regard to specific allusion across poems (what is the difference between a poet making a specific reprise within a single poem over some 12,000 verses, his making a specific reprise between two poems of his own composition, and his making a specific reprise from a poem composed by another poet?), and in practice scholars are often found to take similar views on each. Thus Hainsworth, reluctant to see intratextual allusion between the two recurring simile pairs in *Odyssey* V and XXIII and VI and XXIII, is also sceptical of intertextual allusion between the Patroklos–Hektor plot line of *Iliad* XVI and the Antilochos–Memnon plot line of the **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* (discussed in § 2.3) and between the scenes of Aphrodite's toilette in Demodokos' second song in *Odyssey* VIII and *HApH* (discussed in §§ 5.1, 5.4).²⁶ It is the argument of this book that we need to be open to the possibility of specific reprises, though exactly where this may take one is a matter for each reader of this book to decide.

²⁴ Quotations respectively from Taplin 1992: 10 and Di Benedetto 1994: 210 n. 3 (translated); cf. *ibid.* 177–238. But see differently, e.g., Willcock 1975.

²⁵ Compare and contrast Bakker 2013: 167–9.

²⁶ Hainsworth 1969: 31; 1988: 371.

References

For abbreviations of journals, see *L'Année philologique*. For other abbreviations, see pp. xi–xii.

- Abusch, T. (1986), 'Ishtar's Proposal and Gilgamesh's Refusal', *History of Religions* 26: 143–87.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. (2010), 'The Prefigured Muse: Rethinking a Few Assumptions on Hellenistic Poetics', in J. J. Clauss and M. Cuypers (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature* (Malden, MA): 81–91.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. (2011), *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry* (Princeton, NJ).
- Agócs, P., Carey, C., and Rawles, R. (eds.) (2012), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge).
- Albinus, L. (2000), *The House of Hades: Studies in Ancient Greek Eschatology* (Aarhus).
- Alden, M. J. (2000), *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad* (Oxford).
- Alexiou, M. (2002), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Lanham, MD and Oxford, 2nd edn, revised by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos).
- Allan, W. (2005), 'Arms and the Man: Euphorbus, Hector, and the Death of Patroclus', *CQ* 55: 1–16.
- Allan, W. (2008), 'Performing the Will of Zeus: The *Διὸς βουλή* and the Scope of Early Greek Epic', in M. Revermann and P. Wilson (eds.), *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford): 204–16.
- Allen, F. D. (1892), 'Prometheus and the Caucasus', *AJPh* 13: 51–61.
- Allen, G. (2011), *Intertextuality* (London, 2nd edn).
- Allen, T. W. (1908), 'The Epic Cycle', *CQ* 2: 64–74, 81–8.
- Allen, T. W. (1912), *Homeri opera: Tomus V Hymnos, Cyclum, Fragmenta, Margiten, Batrachomyomachiam, Vitas continens* (Oxford).
- Allen, T. W., Halliday, W. R., and Sikes, E. E. (1936), *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford).
- Allison, R. S. (1997), 'Monogenesis/polygenesis', in Green (ed.): ii.561–2.
- Aloni, A. (1989), *L'aedo e i tiranni: Ricerche sull'Inno omerico a Apollo* (Rome).
- Alster, B. (1972), *Dumuzi's Dream: Aspects of Oral Poetry in a Sumerian Myth* (Copenhagen).
- Alster, B. (1985), 'Sumerian Love Songs', *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 79: 127–59.
- Alster, B. (1999a), 'Tammuz', *DDD*: 828–34.
- Alster, B. (1999b), 'Tiamat', *DDD*: 867–9.
- Alster, B. (2011), 'Variation in Sumerian Myths as a Reflection of Literary Creativity', in F. Hagen, J. Johnston, W. Monkhouse, K. Piquette, J. Tait, and M. Worthington (eds.), *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East: Literary and Linguistic Approaches* (Leuven): 55–79.
- Amodio, M. C. (2005), 'Res(ist)ing the Singer: Towards a Non-Performative Anglo-Saxon Oral Poetics', in Amodio (ed.): 179–208.

- Amodio, M. C. (ed.) (2005), *New Directions in Oral Theory* (Tempe, AZ).
- Anastassiou, J. (1969), 'ἀπατάω', *Lfgre* vi.1001–3.
- Andersen, Ø. (1977), 'Odysseus and the Wooden Horse', *SO* 52: 5–18.
- Andersen, Ø. (1990), 'The Making of the Past in the *Iliad*', *HSCPh* 93: 25–45.
- Andersen, Ø. (1997), 'Diomedes, Aphrodite, and Dione: Background and Function of a Scene in Homer's *Iliad*', *C&M* 48: 25–36.
- Andersen, Ø. (2011), 'Homeridae', in Finkelberg (ed.): ii.365–6.
- Andersen, Ø. (2012), 'Older Heroes and Earlier Poems: The Case of Heracles in the *Odyssey*', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 138–51.
- Andersen, Ø. and Dickie, M. (eds.) (1995), *Homer's World: Fiction, Tradition, Reality* (Bergen).
- Andersen, Ø. and Haug, D. T. T. (eds.) (2012), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Andersen, Ø. and Haug, D. T. T. (2012), 'Introduction', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 1–19.
- Anderson, G. (2000), *Fairytale in the Ancient World* (London).
- Anderson, M. J. (1997), *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art* (Oxford).
- Archi, A. (2007), 'Transmission of Recitative Literature by the Hittites', *Altorientalische Forschungen* 34/2: 185–203.
- Arend, W. (1933), *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer* (Berlin).
- Arnould, D. (1990), *Le Rire et les larmes dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Platon* (Paris).
- Athanassaki, L. (2012), 'Performance and Re-performance: The Siphnian Treasury Evoked (Pindar's *Pythian* 6, *Olympian* 2 and *Isthmian* 2)', in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.): 134–57.
- Attridge, H. W. and Oden, R. A. (1981), *Philon of Byblos: The Phoenician History. Introduction, Critical Text, Translation, Notes* (Washington DC).
- Aura Jorro, F. and Adrados, F. R. (1985–93), *Diccionario griego-español: Diccionario micénico i–ii* (Madrid).
- Austin, N. (1972), 'Name Magic in the *Odyssey*', *CSCA* 5: 1–19.
- Austin, N. (1975), *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Austin, N. (1991), 'The Wedding Text in Homer's *Odyssey*', review of Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, *Arion* 1: 227–43.
- Austin, R. G. (1971), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus* (Oxford).
- Bachvarova, M. R. (2005), 'The Eastern Mediterranean Epic Tradition from "Bilgames and Akka" to the "Song of Release" to Homer's *Iliad*', *GRBS* 45: 131–53.
- Bachvarova, M. R. (2009), 'Hittite and Greek Perspectives on Travelling Poets, Texts and Festivals', in Hunter and Rutherford (eds.): 23–45.
- Bachvarova, M. R. (2016), *From Hittite to Homer: The Anatolian Background of Ancient Greek Epic* (Cambridge).
- Bakhtin, M. M. and Volosinov, V. N. (1986), *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, trans. by L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Bakker, E. J. (1988), *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer. Scalarity and the Description of the Particle per* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA).
- Bakker, E. J. (1993), 'Activation and Preservation: The Interdependence of Text and Performance in an Oral Tradition', *Oral Tradition* 8/1: 5–20.

- Bakker, E. J. (1997), *Poetry in Speech. Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca, NY and London).
- Bakker, E. J. (2013), *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey* (Cambridge).
- Bakker, E. J. and Kahane, A. (eds.) (1997), *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance and the Epic Text* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Bakola, E. (2010), *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy* (Oxford and New York).
- Balot, R. K. (1998), 'Pindar, Virgil, and the Proem to *Georgic* 3', *Phoenix* 52: 83–94.
- Bär, S. and Baumbach, M. (2015), 'The Epic Cycle and Imperial Greek Epic', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 604–22.
- Barchiesi, A. (1984), *La traccia del modello. Effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana* (Pisa); English translation: *Homeric Effects in Vergil's Narrative* (Princeton, NJ, 2015).
- Barchiesi, A. (1994), 'Rappresentazioni del dolore e interpretazione nell'Eneide', *A & A* 40: 109–24; English translation: 'Representations of Suffering and Interpretation in the *Aeneid*', in P. Hardie (ed.), *Virgil: Critical Assessments of Classical Authors* (London and New York, 1999): iii.324–44.
- Barchiesi, A. (2001 [1989]), 'Voices and Narrative "Instances" in the *Metamorphoses*', in Barchiesi 2001: 49–78; first published: *MD* 23 (1989): 55–97.
- Barchiesi, A. (2001 [1993]), 'Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and the *Heroides*', in Barchiesi 2001: 105–27; first published: *HSCPh* 95 (1993): 333–65.
- Barchiesi, A. (2001 [1995]), 'Tropes of Intertextuality in Roman Epic', in Barchiesi 2001: 129–40; first published: *Lexis* 13 (1995) 49–67.
- Barchiesi, A. (2001), *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets* (London).
- Barker, E. T. E. (2008), 'Momos Advises Zeus: Changing Representations of "Cypria" fragment 1', in E. Cingano and L. Milano (eds.), *Papers on Ancient Literatures: Greece, Rome, and the Near East: Proceedings of the Advanced Seminar in the Humanities, Venice International University 2004–2005* (Padua): 33–73.
- Barker, E. T. E. and Christensen, J. P. (2008), 'Oedipus of Many Pains: Strategies of Contest in the Homeric Poems', in *Leeds International Classical Studies* 7/2: 1–30; <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/classics/lics/2008/200802.pdf>.
- Barker, E. T. E. and Christensen, J. P. (2011), 'On Not Remembering Tydeus: Agamemnon, Diomedes and the Contest for Thebes', *MD* 66: 9–43.
- Barker, E. T. E. and Christensen, J. P. (2014), 'Even Heracles Had to Die: Homeric "Heroism", Mortality and the Epic Tradition', in Tsagalis (ed.): 249–77.
- Barlow, M. and Kemmer, S. (eds.) (2000), *Usage Based Models of Language* (Stanford, CA).
- Barnes, T. G. (2011), 'Homeric ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην', *JHS* 131: 1–13.
- Baumbach, M. (2012), 'Borderline Experiences with Genre: the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* between Epic, Hymn and Epyllic Poetry', in Baumbach and Bär (eds.): 135–48.
- Baumbach, M. and Bär, S. (eds.) (2007), *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* (Berlin and New York).
- Baumbach, M. and Bär, S. (eds.) (2012), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception* (Leiden and Boston).
- Baumgarten, A. I. (1981), *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos* (Leiden).

- Beaulieu, M.-C. (2004), 'L'Héroisation du poète Hésiode en Grèce ancienne', *Kernos* 17: 103–17.
- Beck, I. (1973), '(εἰν) Ἀρίμοις, -σιν', *Lfgre* vii.1275–7.
- Beck, W. A. (1973), 'Ἀφροδίτη', *Lfgre* ix.1719–26.
- Becking, B. (1999), 'Japheth', *DDD*: 662–3.
- Beckman, G. (1983), 'Mesopotamians and Mesopotamian Learning at Hattuša', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 35: 97–114.
- Beckman, G. (2003), 'Gilgamesh in Hatti', in G. Beckman, R. Beal, and G. MacMahon (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Winona Lake, IN): 37–57.
- Beekes, R. (2010), *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* i–ii (Leiden and Boston).
- Belsey, A. (1995), 'Hypothesis', in T. Honderich (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (Oxford): 385.
- Ben-Amos, D. (1984), 'The Seven Strands of Tradition: Varieties in Its Meaning in American Folklore Studies', *Journal of Folklore Research* 21: 97–131.
- Benediktson, D. T. (1985), 'Propertius' "Elegiacization" of Homer', *Maia* 37: 17–26.
- Bernabé, A. (1995), 'Influences orientales dans la littérature grecque: quelques réflexions de méthode', *Kernos* 8: 9–22.
- Bernabé, A. (2004a), *Poetae epici Graeci. Pars II. Orphicorum et Orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta. Fasciculus 1* (Munich and Leipzig).
- Bernabé, A. (2004b), 'Hittites and Greeks. Mythical Influences and Methodological Considerations', in R. Rollinger and C. Ulf (eds.), *Griechische Archaik. Interne Entwicklungen—Externe Impulse* (Berlin): 291–310.
- Bernabé, A. (2008), 'Poemas sobre el mundo, la vida, el alma, el más allá. Himnos y epigramas. Poesía mántica', in Bernabé and Casadesús (eds.): i.393–422.
- Bernabé, A. and Casadesús, F. (eds.) (2008), *Orfeo y la tradición órfica: un reencuentro* i–ii (Madrid).
- Bernsdorff, H. (2011), 'Notes on P.Oxy. 3722 (Commentary on Anacreon)', *ZPE* 178: 29–34.
- Berthold, O. (1911), *Die Unverwundbarkeit in Sage und Aberglauben der Griechen* (Giessen).
- Betegh, G. (2004), *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation* (Cambridge).
- Bethe, E. (1922), *Homer, Dichtung und Sage* ii: *Odyssee, Kyklos, Zeitbestimmung* (Leipzig).
- Bettini, M. and Franco, C. (2010), *Il mito di Circe: Immagini e racconti dalla Grecia a oggi* (Turin).
- Beye, C. R. (1984), 'Repeated Similes in the Homeric Poems', in K. J. Rigsby (ed.), *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday = GRBS Monographs* 10 (Durham, NC): 7–13.
- Bierl, A. (2012a), 'Orality, Fluid Textualization and Interweaving Themes. Some Remarks on the *Doloneia*: Magical Horses from Night to Light and Death to Life', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 133–74.
- Bierl, A. (2012b), 'Demodokos' Song of Ares and Aphrodite in Homer's *Odyssey* (8.266–366): an Epyllion? Agonistic Performativity and Cultural Metapoetics', in Baumbach and Bär (eds.): 111–32.

- Biles, Z. P. (2011), *Aristophanes and the Poetics of Competition* (Cambridge).
- Bing, P. (1988), *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen).
- Black, J. A. (1983), 'Babylonian Ballads: A New Genre', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103: 25–34.
- Black, J. A. (1998), *Reading Sumerian Poetry* (London).
- Black, J. A., Cunningham, G., Robson, E., and Zólyomi, G. (2004), *The Literature of Ancient Sumer* (Oxford).
- Blößner, N. (1991), *Die singulären Iterata der Ilias: Bücher 16–20* (Stuttgart).
- Blößner, N. (1994), 'Die singulären Iterata der "Ilias", Eine Richtigstellung', *Mnemosyne* 47: 672–6.
- Blößner, N. (2006), 'Relative Chronologie im frühgriechischen Epos: Eine empirische Methode und erste Ergebnisse', in A. Luther (ed.), *Geschichte und Fiktion in der homerischen Odyssee* (Munich) = *Zetemata* 125: 19–46.
- Blümer, W. (2001), *Interpretation archaischer Dichtung. Die mythologischen Partien der Erga Hesiods i–ii*. (Münster).
- Blush, J. (1970), *Formen und Inhalt von Hesiods individuellem Denken. Zur Frage der dichterischen Einheit der Werke und Tage* (Bonn).
- Boardman, J. (2002), *The Archaeology of Nostalgia: How the Greeks Recreated their Mythical Past* (London).
- Boedeker, D. D. (1974), *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic* (Leiden).
- Böhme, R. (1953), *Orpheus: Das Alter des Kitharoden* (Berlin).
- Böhme, R. (1970), *Orpheus: der Sänger und seine Zeit* (Bern).
- Böhme, R. (1983), *Peisistratos und sein homerischer Dichter* (Bern).
- Böhme, R. (1988), 'Homer oder Orpheus?', *ZPE* 71: 25–31.
- Böhme, R. (1991), *Der Lykomide: Tradition und Wandel zwischen Orpheus und Homer* (Bern).
- Borger, R. (1996), *Beiträge zum Inschriftwerk Assurbanipals* (Wiesbaden).
- Bowie, A. M. (2013), *Homer Odyssey Books XIII and XIV* (Cambridge).
- Bowra, C. M. (1952), *Heroic Poetry* (London).
- Brandt, H. (1978), 'ἄττα', *Lfgre* ix.1519.
- Braswell, B. K. (1971), 'Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*', *CQ* 21: 16–26.
- Braswell, B. K. (1981), 'Odyssey 8.166–77 and *Theogony* 79–93', *CQ* 31: 237–9.
- Braswell, B. K. (1982), 'A Grammatical Note on *Cypria*, Fr. 4 K', *Glotta* 60: 221–5.
- Braswell, B. K. (1988), *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin and New York).
- Braswell, B. K. (1998), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Berlin and New York).
- Bravo, B. (2000), 'Pseudo-Herodotus and Pseudo-Thucydides on Scythia, Thrace and the Regions "Beyond"', *ASNP* 5: 21–112.
- Bravo, B. (2001), 'Un frammento della *Piccola Iliade* (P. Oxy. 2510), lo stile narrativo tardo-arcaico, i racconti su Achille immortale', *QUCC* 67: 49–114.
- Breitenberger, B. (2007), *Aphrodite and Eros. The Development of Erotic Mythology in Early Greek Poetry and Cult* (New York and London).
- Bremer, J. M., de Jong, I. J. F., and Kalff, J. (eds.) (1987), *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry. Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretation* (Amsterdam).
- Bremmer, J. (ed.) (1987), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London).

- Bremmer, J. (2008), *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible, and the Ancient Near East* (Leiden and Boston).
- Breslove, D. (1943), 'How Old Were Achilles and Neoptolemus?', *CJ* 39: 159–61.
- Brillet-Dubois, P. (2011), 'An Erotic Aristeia: The Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* and its Relation to the Iliadic Tradition', in Faulkner (ed.): 105–32.
- Brink, C. O. (1971), *Horace on Poetry ii: The 'Ars Poetica'* (Cambridge).
- Brisch, N. M. (2007), *Tradition and the Poetics of Innovation. Sumerian Court Literature of the Larsa Dynasty (c.2003–1763 BCE)* (Münster).
- Brisch, N. M. (2011), 'Changing Images of Kingship in Sumerian Literature', in Radner and Robson (eds.): 706–24.
- Brogyanyi, B. and Lipp, R. (eds.) (1992), *Historical Philology, Greek, Latin, and Romance: Papers in Honor of Oswald Szemerényi ii* (Amsterdam).
- Brown, J. P. (1995–2001), *Israel and Hellas i–iii* (Berlin).
- Bryce, T. (2002), *Life and Society in the Hittite World* (Oxford).
- Bryce, T. (2009), *The Routledge Handbook of the Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia. The Near East from the Early Bronze Age to the Fall of the Persian Empire* (London and New York).
- Budelmann, F. and Haubold, J. (2008), 'Reception and Tradition', in L. Hardwick and C. Stray (eds.), *A Companion to Classical Receptions* (Oxford): 13–25.
- Budin, S. L. (2010), 'Aphrodite *Enoplion*', in Smith and Pickup (eds.): 79–112.
- Buecheler, F. (1907), 'Paraphrase eines Gedichtes über den Raub der Persephone', in W. Schubart and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (eds.), *Griechische Dichterfragmente: Erste Hälfte: Epische und elegische Fragmente, Berliner Klassikertexte v* (Berlin): 1–12.
- Burgess, J. S. (1996), 'The Non-Homeric *Cypria*', *TAPhA* 126: 77–99.
- Burgess, J. S. (1997), 'Beyond Neoanalysis: Problems with the Vengeance Theory', *AJPh* 118: 1–19.
- Burgess, J. S. (1999), 'Gilgamesh and Odysseus in the Otherworld', *Classical Views/Échos du monde classique* 43 (n.s. 18): 171–210.
- Burgess, J. S. (2001), *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore, MD).
- Burgess, J. S. (2002), 'Kyprias, the "Kypria" and Multiformality', *Phoenix* 56: 234–45.
- Burgess, J. S. (2004), 'Early Images of Achilles and Memnon?', *QUCC* 76: 33–51.
- Burgess, J. S. (2005a), 'The Epic Cycle and Fragments', in J. M. Foley (ed.): 344–52.
- Burgess, J. S. (2005b), 'The Death of Achilles by Rhapsodes', in R. Rabel (ed.), *Approaches to Homer, Ancient and Modern* (Swansea): 119–34.
- Burgess, J. S. (2006), 'Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference', *Oral Tradition* 21/1: 148–89.
- Burgess, J. S. (2009), *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles* (Baltimore, MD).
- Burgess, J. S. (2010), 'The Hypertext of Astyanax', in C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Homeric Hypertextuality = Trends in Classics ii.2* (Berlin): 211–24.
- Burgess, J. S. (2012a), 'Intertextuality without Text in Early Greek Epic', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 168–83.
- Burgess, J. S. (2012b), 'Belatedness in the Travels of Odysseus', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 269–90.
- Burgess, J. S. (2015), *Homer* (London and New York).

- Burkert, W. (1960), 'Das Lied von Ares and Aphrodite: Zum Verhältnis von Odyssee und Ilias', *RhM* 103: 30–44 (reprinted in Burkert 2001: 105–16; English translation in G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones (eds.): 249–62).
- Burkert, W. (1972), 'Die Leistung eines Kreophylos: Kreophyleer, Homeriden und die archaische Heraklesepi', *MH* 29: 74–85 = Burkert 2001: 138–49.
- Burkert, W. (1977), review of N. J. Richardson 1974, *Gnomon* 49: 440–6.
- Burkert, W. (1979), 'Kynaithos, Polycrates and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo', in G. W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, and C. J. Putnam (eds.), *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox* (Berlin and New York): 53–62 = Burkert 2001: 189–97.
- Burkert, W. (1979), 'Von Ullikummi zum Kaukasus: die Felsgeburt des Unholds. Zur Kontinuität einer mündlichen Erzählung', *Wü rz. Jahrb. für die Altertumswissenschaft* NF 5: 253–61 = Burkert 2003: 87–95.
- Burkert, W. (1979a), *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley, CA).
- Burkert, W. (1983), *Homo necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (Berkeley and Los Angeles); English translation of *Homo necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen* (Berlin and New York, 1972).
- Burkert, W. (1984), *Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion und Literatur* (Heidelberg); English translation = Burkert 1992.
- Burkert, W. (1985), *Greek Religion* (Oxford); first published: *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart, 1977).
- Burkert, W. (1985), 'Opferritual bei Sophokles. Pragmatik-Symbolik-Theater', *Der altsprachliche Unterricht* 27/2: 5–20 = Burkert 2007: 73–91.
- Burkert, W. (1987), 'The Making of Homer in the 6th Century B.C.: Rhapsodes versus Stesichorus', in D. von Bothmer et al., *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World* (Malibu, CA): 43–62 = Burkert 2001: 198–217; also reprinted in D. L. Cairns (ed.): 92–116.
- Burkert, W. (1987), 'Oriental and Greek Mythology: The Meeting of Parallels', in Bremmer (ed.): 10–40 = Burkert 2003: 48–72.
- Burkert, W. (1990), 'Herodot als Historiker fremder Religionen', in *Hérodote et les peuples non grecs. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 35: 1–32 = Burkert 2007: 140–60.
- Burkert, W. (1991), 'Homerstudien und Orient', in J. Latacz (ed.), *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung: Rückblick und Ausblick* (Stuttgart and Leipzig): 155–81 = Burkert 2001: 30–58.
- Burkert, W. (1992), *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge MA); English translation of Burkert 1984.
- Burkert, W. (1995), '"Irrevocabile verbum": Spuren mündlichen Erzählens in der Odyssee', in U. Brunold-Bigler and H. Bausinger (eds.), *Hören—Sagen—Lesen—Lernen. Bausteine zu einer Geschichte der kommunikativen Kultur. Festschrift für Rudolf Schenda zum 65. Geburtstag* (Bern): 147–58 = Burkert 2001: 117–26.
- Burkert, W. (2001), *Kleine Schriften i Homeric* (Göttingen).
- Burkert, W. (2002), 'Die Waffen und die Jungen: Homerisch *ΟΠΛΟΤΕΡΟΙ*', in Reichel and Rengakos (eds.): 31–4.
- Burkert, W. (2003), *Kleine Schriften ii Orientalia* (Göttingen).

- Burkert, W. (2004), *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Burkert, W. (2005), 'Near Eastern Connections', in J. M. Foley (ed.): 291–301.
- Burkert, W. (2007), *Kleine Schriften VII Tragica et Historica* (Göttingen).
- Burkert, W. (2013), 'Varianten der Kulturbegegnung im 8. und 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr.', in Ulf and Rollinger (eds.): 409–23.
- Burnett, A. P. (1991), 'Signals from the Unconscious in Early Greek Poetry', *CPh* 86: 275–300.
- Burrow, C. (1997), 'Virgils, from Dante to Milton', in Martindale (ed.): 79–90.
- Burton, R. W. B. (1962) *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford).
- Byre, C. S. (1988), 'Penelope and the Suitors before Odysseus: *Odyssey* 18.158–303', *AJPh* 109: 159–73.
- Caduff, G. A. (1986), *Antike Sintflutsagen* (Göttingen).
- Cairns, D. L. (ed.) (2001), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford).
- Cairns, D. L. (2001), 'Introduction', in D. L. Cairns (ed.): 1–56.
- Cairns, D. L. (2009), 'Weeping and Veiling: Grief, Display and Concealment in Ancient Greek Culture', in Fögen (ed.): 37–58.
- Cairns, D. L. (2010), *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes* (3, 5, 9, 11, 13) (Cambridge).
- Cairns, F. (1979), *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge).
- Calame, C. (1997), 'Figures of Sexuality and Initiatory Transition in the Derveni Papyrus and its Commentary', in Laks and Most (eds.): 65–80.
- Cannatà Fera, M. (1986), 'Pindaro interprete di Omero in "Pyth." 3, 81–2', *GIF* 38: 85–9.
- Cantilena, M. (1982), *Ricerche sulla dizione epica*. vol. i *Per uno studio della formularità degli Inni Omerici* (Rome).
- Cantilena, M. (2012), 'Oralità, tradizione, testo: tre dimensioni della questione omerica', in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (eds.), *I papiri omerici. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 9–10 giugno 2011* (Florence): 79–95.
- Carey, C. (1980), 'Homeric Hymn to Apollo, 171', *CQ* 30: 288–90.
- Carey, C. (2015), 'Stesichorus and the Epic Cycle', in Finglass and Kelly: 45–62.
- Carpenter, R. (1946), *Folk Tale, Fiction and Saga in the Homeric Epics* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Carrara, L. (2011), '"The very worst that could have been chosen": la funzione dell'exemplum di Titono nell'Inno omerico ad Afrodite', in Aloni and Ornaghi (eds.): 81–115.
- Cassio, A. C. (2012), 'Kypris, Kythereia and the Fifth Book of the *Iliad*', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 413–26.
- Càssola, F. (ed.) (1975), *Inni omerici* (Milan).
- Cavigneaux, A. and Al-Rawi, F. N. H. (1993), 'Gilgameš et Taureau de Ciel (šul-mè-kam) (Textes de Tell Haddad IV)', *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie orientale* 87 (Paris): 97–129.
- Chantraine, P. (1968–80), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* i–ii (Paris).
- Chappell, M. (2011), 'The Homeric Hymn to Apollo: The Question of Unity', in Faulkner (ed.): 59–81.
- Chiodi, S. M. (2000), 'Introduzione', in G. Pettinato (ed.), *Nergal ed Ereškigal. Il poema assiro-babilonese degli inferi* (Rome): 7–44.

- Cingano, E. (2005), 'A Catalogue Within a Catalogue: Helen's Suitors in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 196–204)', in Hunter (ed.): 118–52.
- Cingano, E. (2009), 'The Hesiodic Corpus', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 91–130.
- Cingano, E. (2010), 'Differenze di età e altre peculiarità narrative in Omero e nel ciclo epico', in E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia* (Alessandria): 77–90.
- Cingano, E. (2011), 'Aporie, parallelismi, riprese e convergenze: la costruzione del ciclo epico', in A. Aloni and M. Ornaghi (eds.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: nuovi contributi* (Messina): 3–26.
- Cingano, E. (2015), 'Epiginoi', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 244–60.
- Clark, M. (1997), *Out of Line: Homeric Composition Beyond the Hexameter* (Lanham, MD; Boulder, CO; New York; and Oxford).
- Clark, M. (2004), 'Formulas, Metre and Type-Scenes', in R. L. Fowler (ed.): 117–38.
- Clark, M. E. and Coulson, W. D. E. (1978), 'Memnon and Sarpedon', *MH* 35: 65–73.
- Clarke, M. J. (2006), 'Achilles, Byrthnoth, and Cú Chulainn: Continuity and Analogy from Homer to the Medieval North', in Clarke, Currie, and †Lyne (eds.): 243–71.
- Clarke, M. J., Currie, B. G. F., and Lyne, R. O. A. M.† (eds.), (2006), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford).
- Clausen, W. (1987), *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Clauss, J. J. (2010), 'From the Head of Zeus: The Beginnings of Roman Literature', in Clauss and Cuypers (eds.): 463–78.
- Clauss, J. J. and Cuypers, M. (eds.) (2010), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature* (Malden, MA).
- Clay, J. S. (1983), *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey* (Princeton, NJ).
- Clay, J. S. (1989), *The Politics of Olympus. Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns* (Princeton, NJ).
- Clay, J. S. (2003), *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge).
- Clay, J. S. (2010), 'Horace and Lesbian Lyric', in Davis (ed.): 128–46.
- Clay, J. S. (2011), 'The Homeric Hymns as Genre', in Faulkner (ed.): 232–53.
- Colakis, M. (1986), 'The Laughter of the Suitors in *Odyssey* 20', *CW* 79: 137–41.
- Čolaković, Z. (2006), 'The Singer Above Tales. Homer, Mededović and Traditional Epics', *SemRom* 9: 161–87.
- Čolaković, Z. and Rojc-Čolaković, M. (2004), *Mrtva glava jezik progovara* (Podgorica).
- Colli, G. (1977), *La sapienza greca I* (Milan).
- Colpe, C. (1979), 'Kasion', in *KP* iii.141.35–57.
- Conte, G. B. (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (Ithaca, NY and London); English translation of *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario* (Turin, 1985).
- Cook, E. F. (1995), *The Odyssey in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins* (Ithaca, NY).
- Cook, E. F. (1999), '"Active" and "Passive" Heroics in the *Odyssey*', *CW* 93: 149–67; reprinted in Doherty (ed.) 2009: 111–34.
- Cook, E. F. (2009), 'On the "Importance" of *Iliad* Book 8', *CPh* 104: 133–61.

- Cooper, J. S. (1993), 'Sacred Marriage and Popular Cult in Early Mesopotamia', in E. Matsushima (ed.), *Official Cult and Popular Religion in the Ancient Near East* (Heidelberg): 81–96.
- Corti, C. (2007), 'The So-Called "Theogony" or "Kingship in Heaven": The Name of the Song', *SMEA* 49.i: 109–21.
- Crane, G. (1988), *Calypso: Backgrounds and Conventions of the Odyssey* (Frankfurt a. M.).
- Croft, W. and Cruse, D. A. (eds.) (2004), *Cognitive Linguistics* (Cambridge).
- Cropp, M. J. (1988), *Euripides' Electra* (Warminster).
- Csapo, E. (2005), *Theories of Mythology* (Oxford).
- Csapo, E. and Slater, W. J. (1994), *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor, MI).
- Currie, B. G. F. (2005), *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).
- Currie, B. G. F. (2006), 'Epilogue', in Clarke, Currie, and †Lyne (eds.): 331–74.
- Currie, B. G. F. (2007), 'Heroes and Holy Men in Early Greece: Hesiod's *theios aner*', in A. Coppola (ed.), *Eroi, eroismi, eroizzazioni* (Padua): 163–203.
- Currie, B. G. F. (2010), 'L'Ode 11 di Bacchilide: il mito delle Pretidi nella lirica corale, nella poesia epica, e nella mitografia', in E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali. Generi poetici e storiografia* (Alessandria): 211–53.
- Currie, B. G. F. (2011), 'Aphrodite', in Finkelberg (ed.): i.63–4.
- Currie, B. G. F. (2012a), 'The *Iliad*, *Gilgamesh* and Neoanalysis', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 543–80.
- Currie, B. G. F. (2012b), 'Hesiod on Human History', in L. Llewellyn-Jones, J. Marincola, and C. A. Maciver (eds.), *History without Historians: Greeks and their Past in the Archaic and Classical Age* (Edinburgh): 37–64.
- Currie, B. G. F. (2013), 'The Genitive *Ὀδυσσεύς* (Od. 24.398) and Homer's "Awkward" Parentheses', *JHS* 133: 21–42.
- Currie, B. G. F. (2015), 'Cypria', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 281–305.
- D'Alessio, G. B. (2004), 'Textual Fluctuations and Cosmic Streams: Ocean and Acheioloios', *JHS* 124: 16–37.
- D'Alessio, G. B. (2005a), 'The *Megalai Ehoiai*: A Survey of the Fragments', in Hunter (ed.): 176–216.
- D'Alessio, G. B. (2005b), 'Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic Genealogical Poetry', in Hunter (ed.): 217–38.
- D'Angour, A. (2011), *The Greeks and the New. Novelty in Ancient Greek Imagination and Experience* (Cambridge).
- Dale, A. M. (1967), *Euripides Helen* (Oxford).
- Dalley, S. (2000), *Myths from Mesopotamia* (Oxford, 2nd edn).
- Dalley, S. (2003), 'Why Did Herodotus Not Mention the Hanging Gardens of Babylon?', in P. Derow and R. C. T. Parker (eds.), *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford): 171–89.
- Dalley, S. (2013), 'First Millenium B.C. Variation in *Gilgamesh*, *Atrahasis*, the Flood Story and the *Epic of Creation*: What was Available to Berossos?', in Haubold, Lanfranchi, Rollinger, and Steele (eds.): 165–76.
- Dalley, S. and Reyes, A. T. (1998), 'Mesopotamian Contact and Influence in the Greek World: 1. To the Persian Conquest', in S. Dalley (ed.), *The Legacy of Mesopotamia* (Oxford): 85–106.
- Danek, G. (1988), *Studien zur Dolonie = WS Beiheft 12* (Vienna).

- Danek, G. (1996), 'Die Apologoi der Odyssee und "Apologoi" im serbo-kroatischen Heimkehrerlied,' *WS* 109: 5–30.
- Danek, G. (1998a), *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee* = *WS Beiheft 22* (Vienna).
- Danek, G. (1998b), 'Mythologische Exempla bei Homer und im südslawischen Heldenlied', in I. Tar (ed.), *Epik durch die Jahrhunderte. Internationale Konferenz Szeged 2–4. Oktober 1997* = *Acta Antiqua et Archaeologica* 27 (Szeged): 82–91.
- Danek, G. (2001), 'Achilles and the *Iliad*', in Paisi-Apostopoulou (ed.): 165–79.
- Danek, G. (2002a), *Bosnische Heldenepen* (Klagenfurt).
- Danek, G. (2002b), 'Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality', in F. Montanari and P. Ascheri (eds.), *Omero tremila anni dopo* (Rome): 3–19.
- Danek, G. (2002c), 'Odysseus between Skylla and Charybdis', in Hurst and Létoublon (eds.): 15–25.
- Danek, G. (2004), 'Der Schiffskatalog der Ilias: Form und Funktion', in H. Heftner and K. Tomaschitz (eds.), *Ad fontes! Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag am 15. September 2004 dargebracht von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden* (Vienna): 59–72.
- Danek, G. (2005a), 'Antenor und die Bittgesandtschaft: Ilias, Bakchylides 15 und der Astarita-Krater', *WS* 118: 5–20.
- Danek, G. (2005b), 'Heldenepik zwischen Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit: Homer und die südslawische Tradition', in S. Haltmeyer and A. Aigner (eds.), *Literalität und Oralität* (Vienna): 33–47.
- Danek, G. (2005c), review of Čolaković and Rojc-Čolaković 2004, *WS* 118: 278–82.
- Danek, G. (2006a), 'Die Gleichnisse der Ilias und der Dichter Homer' in F. Montanari (ed.), *La Poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire* (Geneva) = *Entretiens Hardt* 52: 41–71 (with 'Discussion', pp. 72–7).
- Danek, G. (2006b), 'Antenor und seine Familie in der Ilias', *WS* 118: 5–20.
- Danek, G. (2007), 'Developments of Traditional Narrative Techniques. Flashback Accounts in Homer and Avdo Međedović', in Z. Čolaković (ed.), *Epika Avda Međedovića: Kritičko izdanje. The Epics of Avdo Međedović: A Critical Edition* (Podgorica): ii.599–618.
- Danek, G. (2010a), 'Agamemnon's Ancestors and Ruža's Bridegroom' in C. Tsaglis (ed.), *Homeric Hypertextuality* (Berlin and New York): 225–38.
- Danek, G. (2010b), 'The Homeric Epics as Palimpsests', in P. S. Alexander and A. Lange (eds.), *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and its Reflections in Medieval Literature* (Leiden and Boston): 123–36.
- Danek, G. (2011), 'Die Ilias als Produkt einer mündlichen Epen-Tradition', in Ulf and Rollinger (eds.): 293–309.
- Danek, G. (2012a), 'The Doloneia Revisited', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 106–21.
- Danek, G. (2012b), 'Homer und Avdo Međedović als "post-traditional singers"?', in Meier-Brügger (ed.): 27–44.
- Davies, M. (1986), *Prolegomena and Paralegomena to a New Edition (with Commentary) of the Fragments of Early Greek Epic* (Göttingen) = *Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 1986/2: 91–101.
- Davies, M. (1989), *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol).

- Davies, M. (2002), 'The Folk-Tale Origins of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*', *WS* 115: 5–43.
- Davies, M. (2010), 'Folk-tale Elements in the *Cypria*,' *Classics@* Volume 6: E. D. Karakantza (ed.), The Center for Hellenic Studies of Harvard University, edition of December 21, 2010.
- Davis, G. (ed.) (2010), *A Companion to Horace* (Malden, MA).
- Day, J. (1985), *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge).
- Day, P. L. (1992), 'Anat: Ugarit's "Mistress of Animals"', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 51: 181–90.
- De Breucker, G. (2011), 'Berossos between Tradition and Innovation', in Radner and Robson (eds.): 637–57.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1987), *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam).
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1989), 'The Biter Bit: A Narratological Analysis of H. Aphr. 45–291', *WS* 102: 13–26.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1991), 'Narratology and Oral Poetry: The Case for Homer', *Poetics Today* 12: 405–23.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2001), *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge).
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2006), 'The Homeric Narrator and His Own *kleos*', *Mnemosyne* 59: 188–207.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2009a), 'Metalepsis in Greek Literature', in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature. Trends in Classics—Supplementary Volumes 4* (Berlin and New York): 87–115.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2009b), 'Between Word and Deed: Hidden Thoughts in the *Odyssey*', in Doherty (ed.): 62–90; first published in I. J. F. de Jong and J. P. Sullivan (eds.), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (Leiden, 1994): 27–50.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2012), *Homer Iliad Book XXII* (Cambridge).
- Debiasi, A. (2004), *L'epica perduta: Eumelo, il Ciclo, l'occidente* (Rome).
- Debiasi, A. (2008), *Esiodo e l'occidente* (Rome).
- Dekel, E. (2012), *Virgil's Homeric Lens* (New York and London).
- Di Benedetto, V. (1994), *Nel laboratorio di Omero* (Turin).
- Di Benedetto, V. (1995), 'Tifone in Pindaro e in Eschilo', *RFIC* 123: 129–39.
- Di Benedetto, V. (2001), 'Reuses of Iliadic Patterns in the *Odyssey*', *RCCM* 43: 7–14; reprinted in V. Di Benedetto, *Il Richiamo del Testo: Contributi di filologia e letteratura* (Pisa, 2007): ii.691–700.
- Dickson, K. M. (1995), *Nestor: Poetic Memory in Greek Epic* (New York).
- Dihle, A. (1970), *Homer-Probleme* (Opladen).
- Dobrov, G. (2001), *Figures of Play: Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics* (Oxford).
- Doherty, L. E. (ed.) (2009), *Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford).
- Doherty, L. E. (2009), 'Introduction', in Doherty 2009: 1–17.
- Dover, K. J. (1993), *Aristophanes Frogs* (Oxford).
- Dowden, K. (1989), *Death and the Maiden. Girls' Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology* (London and New York).
- Dowden, K. (1996), 'Homer's Sense of Text', *JHS* 116: 47–61.

- Dowden, K. (2004), 'The Epic Tradition in Greece', in R. L. Fowler (ed.): 188–205.
- Dräger, P. (1993), *Argo Pasimelousa. Der Argonautenmythos in der griechischen und römischen Literatur. Teil 1: Theos Aitios* (Stuttgart).
- Dräger, P. (1997), *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods* (Stuttgart).
- Duckworth, G. E. (1933), *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius and Vergil* (Princeton, NJ).
- Du  , C. (2002), *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis* (Lanham, MD).
- Du  , C. (2009), 'Epea pteroenta: How We Come to Have our *Iliad*', in C. Du   (ed.), *Recapturing a Homeric Legacy: Images and Insights from the Venetus A Manuscript of the Iliad* (Washington DC): 19–30.
- Du  , C. and Ebbott, M. (2010), *Iliad 10 and the Poetics of Ambush: A Multitext Edition with Essays and Commentary* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Dukat, Z. (1998), 'More on Yugoslavia as an "Oral Epic Laboratory": A Response to Th  r  se de Vet', *TAPhA* 128: 325–9.
- Dumas-Reungoat, C. (2010), 'Hymnes hom  riques    D  m  ter et    Aphrodite, hymnes et po  mes de M  sopotamie: points de comparaison', *Gaia* 13: 153–76.
- Dunkel, G. E. (1988–91), 'Vater Himmels Gattin'. *Die Sprache* 34: 1–26.
- Dunn, F. M. (1996), *Tragedy's End: Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama* (Oxford).
- Easterling, P. E. (1982), *Sophocles Trachiniae* (Cambridge).
- Easterling, P. E. (1993), 'Gods on Stage in Greek Tragedy', in J. Dalfen, G. Petersman, and F. F. Schwarz (eds.), *Religio Graeco-Romana: Festschrift f  r Walter P  tscher, Gr  z  r Beitr  ge Supplementband V* (Graz-Horn): 77–86.
- Easterling, P. E. (1997), 'Form and Performance', in P. E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge): 151–77.
- Ebeling, E. (1922), *Ein Hymnen-Katalog aus Assur. Berliner Beitr  ge zur Keilschriftforschung* i.3 (Berlin).
- Edmunds, L. (1997), 'Myth in Homer', in Powell and Morris (eds.): 415–41.
- Edmunds, L. (2001), *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore, MD and London).
- Edmunds, L. (2005), 'Epic and Myth', in Foley (ed.): 31–44.
- Edwards, A. T. (1985), 'Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Aethiopis*', *GRBS* 26: 215–27.
- Edwards, G. P. (1971), *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford).
- Edwards, M. W. (1980), 'Convention and Individuality in *Iliad* 1', *HSCPh* 84: 1–28.
- Edwards, M. W. (1987a), *Homer: Poet of the Iliad* (Baltimore, MD).
- Edwards, M. W. (1987b), 'Topos and Transformation in Homer', in Bremer, de Jong, and Kalff (eds.): 47–60.
- Edwards, M. W. (1990), 'Neoanalysis and Beyond', *ClAnt* 9: 311–25.
- Edwards, M. W. (1991), *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 5: Books 17–20* (Cambridge).
- Edwards, M. W. (1992), 'Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene', *Oral Tradition* 7/2: 284–330.
- Edwards, M. W. (2011), 'Neoanalysis', in Finkelberg (ed.): ii.566–7.
- Eide, T. (1999), 'Reformulated Repetitions in Homer', *SO* 74: 97–139.
- Elmer, D. F. (2010), 'Kita and Kosmos: The Poetics of Ornamentation in Bosniac and Homeric Epic', *Journal of American Folklore* 123: 276–303.

- Emlyn-Jones, C. (1984), 'The Reunion of Penelope and Odysseus', *G&R* 31: 1–18; reprinted in I. McAuslan and P. Walcott (eds.), *Homer* (Oxford, 1998): 126–43, with Addendum, pp. 153–4.
- Erbse, H. (1970), 'Zeus und Here auf dem Idagebirge', *A&A* 16: 93–112.
- Erbse, H. (1971), review of F. Vian, *Quintus de Smyrne, La Suite d'Homère* iii (Paris, 1969): *Gnomon* 43: 563–8.
- Erbse, H. (1972), *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee* (Berlin); English translation of pp. 177–229 in G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones 1997: 263–320.
- Erbse, H. (1986), *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos* (Berlin and New York).
- Erbse, H. (1993), 'Nestor und Antilochos bei Homer und Arktinos', *Hermes* 121: 385–403.
- Erp Taalman Kip, A. M. van (1990), *Reader and Spectator: Problems in the Interpretation of Greek Tragedy* (Amsterdam).
- Fantuzzi, M. (2012), *Achilles in Love: Intertextual Studies* (Oxford).
- Fantuzzi, M. (2014), 'Epic Cycle', in R. F. Thomas and J. M. Ziolkowski (eds.): i.437–9.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. L. (2004), *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge); first published as *Muse e modelli. La poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto* (Rome, 2002).
- Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. (eds.) (2015), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge).
- Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. (2015), 'Introduction: Kyklos, the Epic Cycle and Cyclic Poetry', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 1–40.
- Faraone, C. A. (1990), 'Aphrodite's *KEΣΤΟΣ* and Apples for Atalanta: Aphrodisiacs in Early Greek Myth and Ritual', *Phoenix* 44: 219–43.
- Faraone, C. A. (1995), 'The *Mystodokos* and the Dark-Eyed Maidens: Multicultural Influences on a Late-Hellenistic Incantation', in M. W. Meyer and P. Mirecki (eds.), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (Leiden): 297–333.
- Faraone, C. A. (1999), *Ancient Greek Love Magic* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Farrell, J. (1991), *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History* (New York and Oxford).
- Farrell, J. (1997), 'The Virgilian Intertext', in Martindale (ed.): 222–38.
- Faulkner, A. (2008), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite. Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Oxford).
- Faulkner, A. (ed.) (2011), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford).
- Faulkner, A. (2011), 'Introduction. Modern Scholarship on the Homeric Hymns: Foundational Issues', in Faulkner (ed.): 1–25.
- Fedeli, P. (2005), *Properzio: Elegie, Libro II. Introduzione, testo e commento* (Cambridge).
- Feeney, D. (1991), *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford).
- Feeney, D. (1998), *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs* (Cambridge).
- Felson, N. and Slatkin, L. M. (2004), 'Gender and Homeric Epic', in R. L. Fowler (ed.): 91–114.

- Fenik, B. (1964), *Iliad X and the Rhesus: The Myth* (Brussels and Berchem).
- Fenik, B. (1968), *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* (Wiesbaden).
- Fenik, B. (1974), *Studies in the Odyssey* (Wiesbaden).
- Fernández-Galiano, M. (1992), 'Books XXI–XXII', in Russo, Fernández-Galiano, and Heubeck: 131–310.
- Ferrara, A. J. (1995), 'Topoi and Stock-Strophes in Sumerian Literary Tradition: Some Observations', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 54: 81–117.
- Finglass, P. J. (2011), *Sophocles Ajax* (Cambridge).
- Finglass, P. J. and Kelly, A. (eds.) (2015), *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge).
- Finkelberg, M. (2000), 'The *Cypria*, the *Iliad*, and the Problem of Multififormity in Oral and Written Tradition', *CPh* 95: 1–11.
- Finkelberg, M. (ed.) (2011), *The Homer Encyclopedia* i–iii (Malden, MA).
- Finkelberg, M. (2012), 'Late Features in the Speeches of the *Iliad*', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 80–95.
- Finkelberg, M. (2015), 'Meta-Cyclic Epic and Homeric Poetry', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 126–38.
- Finley, J. H. Jr (1978), *Homer's Odyssey* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Finnegan, R. (1974), 'How Oral is Oral Literature?', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 37: 52–64.
- Finnegan, R. (1977), *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance, and Social Context* (Cambridge).
- Flory, S. (1978), 'Laughter, Tears and Wisdom in Herodotus', *AJPh* 99: 145–53.
- Floyd, E. D. (1969), 'The Singular Uses of *ἡμέτερος* and *ἡμεῖς* in Homer', *Glotta* 47: 116–37.
- Flückiger-Hawker, E. (1999), *Urnamma of Ur in Sumerian Literary Tradition* (Fribourg and Göttingen).
- Fögen, T. (ed.) (2009), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World* (Berlin).
- Foley, H. P. (1994), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Princeton, NJ).
- Foley, H. P. (2009), '"Reverse Similes" and Sex Roles in the *Odyssey*', in Doherty (ed.): 189–207; first published: *Arethusa* 11 (1978): 7–26.
- Foley, J. M. (1990), *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford).
- Foley, J. M. (1991), *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington, IN).
- Foley, J. M. (1995), *The Singer of Tales in Performance* (Bloomington, IN).
- Foley, J. M. (1997a), 'Oral Tradition and its Implications', in Morris and Powell (eds.): 146–73.
- Foley, J. M. (1997b), 'Traditional Signs and Homeric Art', in Bakker and Kahane (eds.): 56–82, 238–43.
- Foley, J. M. (1998), 'Individual Poet and Epic Tradition: Homer as Legendary Singer', *Arethusa* 31: 149–78.
- Foley, J. M. (1999), *Homer's Traditional Art* (University Park, PA).
- Foley, J. M. (2000), 'The Textualization of South Slavic Oral Epic and its Implications for Oral-Derived Epic', in Honko (ed.): 71–86.
- Foley, J. M. (2002), *How to Read an Oral Poem* (Urbana, IL and Chicago).
- Foley, J. M. (2004), 'Epic as Genre', in R. L. Fowler (ed.): 171–87.

- Foley, J. M. (ed.) (2005), *A Companion to Ancient Epic* (Malden, MA).
- Foley, J. M. (2005a), 'Analogues: Modern Oral Epics', in J. M. Foley (ed.): 196–212.
- Foley, J. M. (2005b), 'South Slavic Oral Epic and the Homeric Question', *Acta Poetica* 26: 51–68.
- Foley, J. M. (2011a), 'Oral-Derived Text', in Finkelberg (ed.): ii.603.
- Foley, J. M. (2011b), 'Oral Dictated Texts', in Finkelberg (ed.): ii.603–4.
- Foley, J. M. (2011c), 'Oral Traditions', in Finkelberg (ed.): ii.607–10.
- Foley, J. M.† and Arft, J. (2015), 'The Epic Cycle and Oral Tradition', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 78–95.
- Föllinger, S. (2009), 'Tears and Crying in Archaic Greek Poetry (especially Homer)' in Fögen (ed.): 17–36.
- Fontenrose, J. (1966), 'Typhon among the Arimoi', in L. Wallach (ed.), *The Classical Tradition. Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan* (Ithaca, NY): 64–82.
- Fontenrose, J. (1981), *Orion: The Myth of the Hunter and the Huntress* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Forbes Irving, P. M. C. (1990), *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths* (Oxford).
- Ford, A. L. (1992), *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca, NY and London).
- Ford, A. L. (2012), review of M. L. West 2011a, *BMCRev* 2012.08.09.
- Forrer, E. (1932), 'Aramu', *RLA* i.131–9.
- Forsyth, N. (1979), 'The Allurement Scene: A Typical Pattern in Greek Oral Epic', *ClAnt* 12: 101–20.
- Foster, B. R. (2005), *Before the Muses. An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (3rd edn, Bethesda, MD).
- Foster, B. R. (2007), *Akkadian Literature of the Late Period* (Münster).
- Fowler, D. P. (1997), 'On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies', *MD* 39: 13–34; reprinted in D. P. Fowler, *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford, 2000): 115–37.
- Fowler, R. L. (1987), *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (Toronto; Buffalo, CO; and London).
- Fowler, R. L. (ed.) (2004), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge).
- Fowler, R. L. (2004), 'The Homeric Question', in Fowler (ed.): 220–32.
- Fowler, R. L. (2013), *Early Greek Mythography ii Commentary* (Oxford).
- Fraenkel, E. (1932), 'Vergil und die Aethiopsis', *Philologus* 87: 242–8.
- Fraenkel, E. (1950), *Aeschylus, Agamemnon i–iii* (Oxford).
- Frahm, E. (2011), *Babylonian and Assyrian Text Commentaries: Origins of Interpretation* (Münster).
- Frame, D. (1978), *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic* (New Haven, CT and London).
- Fränkel, H. (1921), *Die homerischen Gleichnisse* (Göttingen); English translation of pp. 98–114 in G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones 1997: 103–23.
- Frazer, J. G. (1921), *Apollodorus, The Library ii* (London and Cambridge, MA).
- Friedrich, P. (1978), *The Meaning of Aphrodite* (Chicago).
- Friedrich, R. (1981), 'On the Compositional Use of Similes in the *Odyssey*', *AJPh* 102: 120–37.
- Friis Johansen, K. (1967), *The Iliad in Early Greek Art* (Copenhagen).
- Frisk, H. (1973–9), *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch i–iii* (Heidelberg).

- Fritz, M. (2003), '...und weinten um Tammuz': *Die Götter Dumuzi-Ama'-ušumgal'anna und Damu* (Münster).
- Führer, R. (1989), 'κάλλος', *LfggrE* xiii.1302.
- Fuhrer, T. (1988), 'A Pindaric Feature in the Poems of Callimachus', *AJPh* 109: 53–68.
- Fuhrer, T. (1992), *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basle and Kassel).
- Funghi, M. S. (1997), 'The Derveni Papyrus', in Laks and Most (eds.): 25–37.
- Furley, W. D. (2011), 'Homeric and Un-Homeric Hexameter Hymns: A Question of Type', in Faulkner (ed.): 206–31.
- Gainsford, P. (2003), 'Formal Analysis of Recognition Scenes in the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 123: 41–59.
- Gale, M. R. (2007), 'Introduction', in M. R. Gale (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Lucretius* (Oxford): 1–17.
- Gantz, T. (1993), *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD and London).
- Garner, R. (1990), *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (London and New York).
- Gärtner, U. (2005), *Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Aeneis: zur Nachwirkung Vergils in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Munich).
- Garvie, A. F. (1994), *Homer: Odyssey Books VI–VIII* (Cambridge).
- Garvie, A. F. (1998), *Sophocles Ajax* (Warminster).
- Garvie, A. F. (2009), *Aeschylus Persae* (Oxford).
- Gentili, B., Bernardini, P. A., Cingano, E., and Giannini, P. (1995), *Pindaro: Le Pitiche* (Verona).
- George, A. (1999), *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (London).
- George, A. (2003), *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic* i–ii (Oxford).
- George, A. (2007), 'The Epic of Gilgamesh: Thoughts on Genre and Meaning', in J. J. Azize and N. K. Weeks (eds.), *Gilgamesh and the World of Assyria: Proceedings of the Conference held at Mandelbaum House, The University of Sydney, 21–23 July 2004 = Ancient Near Eastern Studies Suppl. 21* (Leuven, Paris, and Dudley, MA): 37–65.
- Giangiulio, M. (2001), 'Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford): 116–37.
- Giangrande, G. (1967), '"Arte Allusiva" and Alexandrian Epic Poetry', *CQ* 17: 85–97.
- Gibert, J. (1997), 'Euripides' Hippolytus Plays—Which Came First?', *CQ* 47: 85–97.
- Gibson, R. K. (2003), *Ovid: Ars Amatoria Book 3* (Cambridge).
- Glenn, J. (1971), 'The Polyphemus Folktale and Homer's *Kyklôpeia*', *TAPhA* 102: 133–81.
- Goldberg, C. (1997), 'Folktale', in Green (ed.): i.356–66.
- Golden, L. (1989), 'Διὸς ἀπάτη and the Unity of *Iliad* 14', *Mnemosyne* 42: 1–11.
- Goldhill, S. (1988), 'Reading Differences: The *Odyssey* and Juxtaposition', *Ramus* 17: 1–31.
- Goody, J. (1987), *The Interface Between the Written and the Oral* (Cambridge).
- Goold, G. P. (1977), 'The Nature of Homeric Composition', *ICS* 2: 1–34.
- Graf, F. (1974), *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Berlin and New York).

- Graf, F. (1987), 'Orpheus: A Poet Among Men', in Bremmer (ed.): 80–106.
- Graf, F. (1997), *Magic in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA and London); English translation of *La Magie dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine: Idéologie et pratique* (Paris, 1994).
- Graf, F. (2008), 'Orfeo, Eleusis y Atenas', in Bernabé and Casadesús (eds.): i.671–96.
- Grafton, A., Most, G. W., and Settis, S. (eds.) (2010), *The Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Gransden, K. W. (1976), *Virgil Aeneid Book VIII* (Cambridge).
- Graves, R. (1955), *The Greek Myths* i–ii (London).
- Graziosi, B. (2002), *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge).
- Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. (2005), *Homer: The Resonance of Epic* (London).
- Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. (2010), *Homer Iliad Book VI* (Cambridge).
- Green, T. A. (ed.) (1997), *Folklore: An Encyclopedia of Beliefs, Customs, Tales, Music and Art* i–ii (Santa Barbara, CA; Denver, CO; and Oxford).
- Greengus, S. (1969), 'The Old Babylonian Marriage Contract', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 89: 505–32.
- Gregory, J. (2005), 'Euripidean Tragedy', in J. Gregory (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Malden, MA): 251–70.
- Gretlein, J. (2007), 'The Poetics of the Bath in the *Iliad*', *HSCPh* 103: 25–49.
- Griffin, A. H. F. (1991), 'Philemon and Baucis in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *G&R* 38: 62–74.
- Griffin, J. (1977), 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97: 39–53; reprinted in D. L. Cairns 2001: 365–84.
- Griffin, J. (1980a), *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford).
- Griffin, J. (1980b), *Homer* (Oxford).
- Griffin, J. (1987a), *Homer: The Odyssey* (Cambridge).
- Griffin, J. (1987b), 'Homer and Excess', in Bremer, de Jong, and Kalff (eds.): 85–104.
- Griffin, J. (1991), Review of Usener 1990, *CR* 41: 288–91.
- Griffin, J. (1992), 'Heroic and Unheroic Ideas in Homer', in C. Emlyn-Jones, L. Hardwick, and J. Purkis (eds.), *Homer: Readings and Images* (London): 21–31; first published in J. Boardman and C. E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), *Chios: A Conference at the Homereion in Chios* (Oxford, 1986): 3–13.
- Griffin, J. (1992), 'Theocritus, the *Iliad*, and the East', *AJPh* 113: 189–211.
- Griffin, J. (1995), *Homer: Iliad IX* (Oxford).
- Griffin, J. (2004), 'The Speeches', in R. L. Fowler (ed.): 156–67.
- Griffith, M. (1978), 'Aeschylus, Sicily, and Prometheus', in R. D. Dawe, J. Diggle, and P. E. Easterling (eds.), *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry Presented to Sir Denys Page on his Seventieth Birthday* (Cambridge): 105–39.
- Gufler, B. (2002), 'Orientalische Wurzeln griechischer Gorgo-Darstellungen', in M. Schuol, U. Hartmann, and A. Luther (eds.), *Grenzüberschreitungen: Formen des Kontakts zwischen Orient und Okzident im Altertum* (Stuttgart): 61–81.
- Guidorizzi, G. (1997), 'The Laughter of the Suitors: A Case of Collective Madness in the *Odyssey*', in L. Edmunds and R. W. Wallace (eds.), *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore, MD): 1–7.
- Gunn, D. M. (1970), 'Narrative Inconsistency and the Oral Dictated Text in the Homeric Epic', *AJPh* 91: 192–203.

- Güterbock, H. G. (1984), 'A Hurro-Hittite Hymn to Ishtar', in J. M. Sasson (ed.), *Studies in Literature from the Ancient Near East by Members of the American Oriental Society Dedicated to Samuel Noah Kramer* (New Haven, CT): 155–64.
- Gutzwiller, K. (2007), *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature* (Malden, MA).
- Gutzwiller, K. (2010), 'Heroic Epitaphs of the Classical Age: The Aristotelian *Peplos* and Beyond', in M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, and I. Petrovic (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge): 219–49.
- Haack, S. (1978), *Philosophy of Logics* (Cambridge).
- Haas, V. (1994), *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (Leiden).
- Haas, V. (1999), *Babylonischer Liebesgarten, Erotik und Sexualität im Alten Orient* (Munich).
- Haas, V. (2006), *Die hethitische Literatur. Texte, Stilistik, Motive* (Berlin and New York).
- Hadjittofi, F. (2007), 'Res Romanae: Cultural Politics in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* and Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*', in Baumbach and Bär (eds.): 357–78.
- Haft, A. J. (1992), 'τὰ (δὲ) δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται: Prophecy and Recollection in the Assemblies of *Iliad* 2 and *Odyssey* 2', *Arethusa* 25: 223–40.
- Haider, P. W. (2005), 'Von Baal Zaphon zu Zeus und Typhon. Zum Transfer mythischer Bilder aus dem vorderorientalischen Raum in die archaisch-griechische Welt', in R. Rollinger (ed.), *Von Sumer bis Homer. Festschrift für Manfred Schretter zum 60. Geburtstag am 25. Februar 2004* (Münster): 303–37.
- Hainsworth, J. B. (1969), *Homer* (Oxford).
- Hainsworth, J. B. (1970), 'The Criticism of an Oral Homer', *JHS* 90: 90–8.
- Hainsworth, J. B. (1984), 'The Fallibility of an Oral Heroic Tradition', in L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies (eds.), *The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context. Papers of the First Greenbank Colloquium, Liverpool, 1981* (Bristol): 111–35.
- Hainsworth, J. B. (1988), 'Books V–VIII', in Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988: 249–385.
- Hainsworth, J. B. (1993), *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 3: Books 9–12* (Cambridge).
- Hajnal, I. (2011), 'Namen und ihre Etymologien—als Beweisstücke nur bedingt tauglich?', in Ulf and Rollinger (eds.): 241–63.
- Hall, E. (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Hall, J. M. (2002), *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago and London).
- Halleran, M. R. (1997), 'It's Not What You Say: Unspoken Allusions in Greek Tragedy?', *MD* 39: 151–63.
- Halliwell, S. (2008), *Greek Laughter: A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity* (Cambridge).
- Halliwell, S. (2011), *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus* (Oxford).
- Halperin, D. M. (1983), 'The Forebears of Daphnis', *TAPhA* 113: 183–200.
- Hansen, W. F. (1972), *The Conference Sequence: Patterned Narration and Narrative Inconsistency in the Odyssey* (Berkeley, CA).
- Hansen, W. F. (2002), *Ariadne's Thread: A Guide to International Tales Found in Classical Literature* (Ithaca, NY).
- Harder, A. (2012), *Callimachus, Aetia i–ii* (Oxford).
- Hardie, P. (1986), *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford).

- Hardie, P. (1993), *The Epic Successors of Virgil* (Cambridge).
- Hardie, P. (1994), *Virgil Aeneid IX* (Cambridge).
- Hardie, P. (1998), *Virgil* (Oxford).
- Hardie, P. (2007), 'Lucretius and Later Latin Literature in Antiquity', in S. Gillespie and P. Hardie (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius* (Cambridge): 111–27.
- Hardie, P. (2014), *The Last Trojan Hero: A Cultural History of Virgil's Aeneid* (London and New York).
- Hardwick, L. (2003), *Reception Studies* (Oxford).
- Harrison, G. and Obbink, D. (1986), 'Vergil, *Georgics* I 36–39 and the Barcelona *Alcestis* (P.Bar. Inv. No. 158–161) 62–65: Demeter in the Underworld', *ZPE* 63: 75–81.
- Harrison, S. J. (1991), *Virgil Aeneid 10* (Oxford).
- Harrison, T. (1998), 'Herodotus' Conception of Foreign Languages', *Histos* 2: 1–45.
- Haslam, M. W. (1991), 'Kleitias, Stesichoros, and the Jar of Dionysos', *TAPhA* 121: 35–45.
- Haslam, M. W. (1997), 'Homeric Papyri and the Transmission of the Text', in Morris and Powell (eds.): 55–100.
- Haslam, M. W. (2011), 'Text and Transmission', in Finkelberg (ed.): iii.848–55.
- Haubold, J. (2006), 'Homer between East and West', *Classics@ Issue 3: The Homerizon: Conceptual Interrogations in Homeric Studies*, Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington DC.
- Haubold, J. (2013a), *Greece and Mesopotamia: Dialogues in Literature* (Cambridge).
- Haubold, J. (2013b), '"The Wisdom of the Chaldaeans": Reading Berossos, *Babyloniaka* Book 1', in Haubold, Lanfranchi, Rollinger, and Steele (eds.): 31–45.
- Haubold, J., Lanfranchi, G. B., Rollinger, R., and Steele, J. (eds.) (2013), *The World of Berossos* (Wiesbaden).
- Heath, J. (1992), 'The Legacy of Peleus: Death and Divine Gifts in the *Iliad*', *Hermes* 120: 387–400.
- Heath, M. (1985), 'Hesiod's Didactic Poetry', *CQ* 35: 245–63.
- Hecker, K. (1969), 'Nergal und Ereškigal', in *Kindlers Literatur-Lexikon* v (Zurich): 386–8.
- Heinze, R. (1993), *Virgil's Epic Technique* (London); English translation of *Virgils epische Technik* (Leipzig and Berlin, 3rd edn, 1915).
- Heitsch, E. (1963), 'Das Prometheus Gedicht bei Hesiod', *RhM* 106: 1–15; reprinted in E. Heitsch (ed.), *Hesiod* (Darmstadt, 1966): 419–35.
- Heitsch, E. (1978), 'Der delische Apollonhymnus und unsere Ilias', in H. G. Beck, A. Kambylis, and P. Moraux (eds.), *Kyklos: Griechisches und Byzantinisches: Rudolf Keydell zum 90. Geburtstag* (Berlin): 20–37.
- Heitsch, E. (2008), 'Neanalytische Antikritik. Zum Verhältnis *Ilias*–*Aithiopsis*', *RhM* 151: 1–12.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. (2006), 'The Birth of Gilgamesh (Ael. NA XII.21). A Case-Study in Literary Receptivity', in R. Rollinger and B. Truschnegg (eds.), *Altertum und Mittelmeerraum: Die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante: Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart): 807–56.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. (2010), 'Beware of Dim Cooks and Cunning Snakes: Gilgamesh, Alexander, and the Loss of Immortality', in R. Rollinger, B. Gufler, M. Lang, and

- I. Madreiter (eds.), *Interkulturalität in der Alten Welt: Vorderasien, Hellas, Ägypten und die vielfältigen Ebenen des Kontakts* (Wiesbaden): 323–59.
- Henrichs, A. (1972), *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos* (Bonn).
- Henrichs, A. (1995), 'Graecia Capta: Roman Views of Greek Culture', *HSCPh* 97: 243–61.
- Henry, R. (1959–91), *Photius*, Bibliothèque i–ix (Paris).
- Herington, J. (1985), *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Herrero de Jáuregui, M. (2008), 'Tradición órfica y tradición homérica', in Bernabé and Casadesús (eds.): 247–78.
- Herrero de Jáuregui, M. (2011), 'Priam's *Catabasis*: Traces of the Epic Journey to Hades in *Iliad* 24', *TAPhA* 141: 37–68.
- Herter, H. (1973), 'Der weinende Astyanax', *Grazer Beiträge* 1: 157–64.
- Hesk, J. (2003), *Sophocles Ajax* (London).
- Heubeck, A. (1950), 'Studien zur Struktur der Ilias (Retardation—Motivübertragung)', in *Gymnasium Fridericianum: Festschrift zur Feier des zweihundertjährigen Bestehens des Humanistischen Gymnasiums Erlangen, 1745–1945* (Erlangen): Teil II: 17–36.
- Heubeck, A. (1954), *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias* (Erlangen).
- Heubeck, A. (1965), 'ΦΙΛΟΜΜΗΔΗΣ ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗ', *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 16: 204–6.
- Heubeck, A. (1974), *Die homerische Frage: Ein Bericht über die Forschung der letzten Jahrzehnte* (Darmstadt).
- Heubeck, A. (1988), 'General Introduction', in Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988: 3–23.
- Heubeck, A. (1989), 'Books IX–XII', in Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989: 1–143.
- Heubeck, A. (1992), 'Books XXIII–XXIV', in Russo, Fernández-Galiano, and Heubeck 1992: 313–418.
- Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A. (1989), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Volume II: Books XI–XVI* (Oxford).
- Heubeck, A., West, S. R., and Hainsworth, J. B. (1988), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Volume I: Introduction and Books I–VIII* (Oxford).
- Hilhorst, A. (1998), 'The Noah Story: Was it Known to the Greeks?', in F. García Martínez and G. P. Luttikhuisen (eds.), *Interpretations of the Flood* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne): 56–65.
- Hillgruber, M. (1990), 'Zur Zeitbestimmung der *Chrestomathie* des Proklos', *RhM* 133: 397–404.
- Hinds, S. E. (1987), *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge).
- Hinds, S. E. (1993), 'Medea in Ovid: Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine', *MD* 30: 9–47.
- Hinds, S. E. (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Hirschberger, M. (2001), 'Die Erzählungen der Frauen in der Nekyia der Odyssee', in Paisi-Apostopoulou (ed.): 123–51.
- Hirschberger, M. (2004), *Gynaikōn Katalogos und Megalai Êhoiai: Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodischer Epen* (Munich).

- Hoekstra, A. (1969), *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Formulaic Tradition. Studies in the Homeric Hymns to Apollo, to Aphrodite, and to Demeter* (Amsterdam and London).
- Hoekstra, A. (1989), 'Books XIII–XVI', in Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989: 145–87.
- Hoffner, H. A. (1998), *Hittite Myths* (Atlanta, GA, 2nd edn).
- Hollis, A. S. (1970), *Ovid, Metamorphoses Book VIII* (Oxford).
- Hollis, A. S. (2007), *Fragments of Roman Poetry c.60 B.C.—A.D. 20* (Oxford).
- Holmberg, I. (1998), 'The Creation of the Ancient Greek Epic Cycle', *Oral Tradition* 13: 458–78.
- Hölscher, U. (1955), review of Schadewaldt 1965 (1951), *Gnomon* 27: 385–99.
- Hölscher, U. (1978), 'The Transformation from Folk-Tale to Epic', in B. Fenik (ed.), *Homer: Tradition and Invention* (Leiden): 51–67.
- Hölscher, U. (1988), *Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman* (Munich).
- Holton, M. and Mihailovich, V. D. (1997), *Songs of the Serbian People from the Collections of Vuk Karadžić* (Pittsburg, PA).
- Honko, L. (ed.), (2000), *Textualization of Oral Epics* (Berlin and New York).
- Honko, L. (2000), 'Text as Process and Practice: The Textualization of Oral Epics', in Honko (ed.): 3–54.
- Hooke, S. H. (1963), *Middle Eastern Mythology from the Assyrians to the Hebrews* (London).
- Hooker, J. T. (1992), 'Some Uses of the Greek Imperfect', in Brogyanyi and Lipp (eds.): 47–65.
- Hopkinson, N. (1994), *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period: An Anthology* (Cambridge).
- Horsfall, N. M. (1979), 'Stesichorus at Bovillae?', *JHS* 99: 26–48.
- Horsfall, N. M. (2003), *Virgil Aeneid 11: A Commentary* (Leiden).
- Horsfall, N. M. (2006), *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary* (Leiden and Boston).
- Horsfall, N. M. (2008), *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary* (Leiden and Boston).
- Howald, E. (1937), *Der Mythos als Dichtung* (Zurich).
- Howald, E. (1946), *Der Dichter der Ilias* (Erlenbach and Zurich).
- Hunter, R. L. (1989), *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautica Book III* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R. L. (1993a), *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R. L. (1993b), *Apollonius of Rhodes: Jason and the Golden Fleece (The Argonautica)* (Oxford).
- Hunter, R. L. (1996), *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R. L. (1999), *Theocritus, A Selection: Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R. L. (2004), 'Homer and Greek Literature', in R. L. Fowler (ed.): 235–53.
- Hunter, R. L. (2005), 'Introduction', in Hunter (ed.): 1–4.
- Hunter, R. L. (ed.) (2005), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R. L. (2009), *Critical Moments in Classical Literature* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R. L. (2012), 'The Songs of Demodokos: Compression and Extension in Greek Narrative Poetry', in Baumbach and Bär (eds.): 83–109.
- Hunter, R. L. and Russell, D. A. (2011), *Plutarch How to Study Poetry (De audiendis poetis)* (Cambridge).

- Hunter, R. L. and Rutherford, I. C. (2009), 'Introduction', in R. L. Hunter and I. C. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge): 1–22.
- Hurst, A. and Létoublon, F. (eds.) (2002), *La Mythologie et l'Odyssée. Homage à G. Germain* (Geneva).
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford).
- Hutchinson, G. O. (2001), *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford).
- Hutchinson, G. O. (2004), 'Euripides' *Other Hippolytus*', *ZPE* 149: 15–28.
- Hutter, M. (1985), *Altorientalische Vorstellungen von der Unterwelt: Literar-und religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu 'Nergal und Ereškigal'* (Freiburg).
- Huxley, G. L. (1969), *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London).
- Instone, S. (1996), *Pindar: Selected Odes* (Warminster).
- Irvine, D. (1978), *Mytharion. The Comparison of Tales from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East* (Neukirchen-Vluyn).
- Irwin, E. (2005), *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation* (Cambridge).
- Jacobsen, T. (1987), *The Harps that Once... Sumerian Poetry in Translation* (New Haven, CT and London).
- Jacoby, F. (1961), 'Die geistige Physiognomie der Odyssee', in F. Jacoby, *Kleine Philologische Schriften* i (Berlin): 107–38; first published: *Antike* 9 (1933) 159–94.
- Jäkel, S. (1994), 'The Phenomenon of Laughter in the *Iliad*', in Jäkel and Timonen (eds.): i.23–7.
- Jäkel, S. and Timonen, A. (eds.) (1994), *Laughter Down the Centuries* (Turku).
- James, A. W. (2004), *Quintus of Smyrna, The Trojan Epic: Posthomeric* (Baltimore, MD and London).
- James, A. W. (2005), 'Quintus of Smyrna', in Foley (ed.): 364–73.
- James, A. W. (2007), 'Quintus of Smyrna and Virgil—A Matter of Prejudice', in Baumbach and Bär (eds.): 145–57.
- James, A. W. and Lee, K. (2000), *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna Posthomeric* V (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne).
- Janko, R. (1982), *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge).
- Janko, R. (1986), review of M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems*, *CPh* 81: 154–9.
- Janko, R. (1992), *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume 4: Books 13–16* (Cambridge).
- Janko, R. (1998a), 'The Homeric Poems as Oral Dictated Texts', *CQ* 48: 1–13.
- Janko, R. (1998b), review of Nagy 1996b, *JHS* 118: 206–7.
- Janko, R. (2001), 'The Derveni Papyrus (*Diagoras of Melos, Apopyrgizontes Logoi?*): A New Translation', *CPh* 96: 1–32.
- Janko, R. (2012), 'πρῶτον τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀεῖδεν: Relative Chronology and the Literary History of the Early Greek Epos', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 20–43.
- Jasanoff, J. H. and Nussbaum, A. (1996), 'Word Games: The Linguistic Evidence in *Black Athena*', in M. R. Lefkowitz and G. M. Rogers (eds.), *Black Athena Revisited* (Chapel Hill, NC and London): 177–205.
- Jebb, R. (1896), *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments* vii Ajax (Cambridge).
- Jensen, M. S. (1980), *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory* (Copenhagen).

- Jensen, M. S. (2000), 'The Writing of the *Ilias* and the *Odyssey*', in Honko (ed.): 57–70.
- Jones, P. (2003), 'Embracing Inana: Legitimation and Mediation in the Ancient Mesopotamian Sacred Marriage Hymn *Iddin-Dagan A*', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123: 291–302.
- Jones, P. V. (1988), *Homer's Odyssey: A Companion to the English Translation of Richmond Lattimore* (Bristol).
- Jones, P. V. (1992), 'The Past in Homer's *Odyssey*', *JHS* 112: 74–90.
- Jones, P. V. (1996), 'The Independent Heroes of the *Iliad*', *JHS* 116: 108–18.
- Jones, P. V. (1997), 'Introduction', in Wright and P. V. Jones (eds.): 1–46.
- Jouan, F. (1966), *Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens* (Paris).
- Jouan, F. (1987), 'Les reprises d'épisodes dans le cycle épique', in J. Servais, T. Hackens, and B. Servais-Soyez (eds.), *Stemmata. Mélanges de philologie, d'histoire et d'archéologie grecques offerts à Jules Labarbe* (Liège): 39–54.
- Kakridis, J. T. (1949), *Homeric Researches* (Lund).
- Kakridis, J. T. (1971), *Homer Revisited* (Lund).
- Kakridis, P. J. (1961), 'Achilleus' Rüstung', *Hermes* 89: 288–97.
- Kakridis, P. J. (1995), 'Odysseus und Palamedes', in Andersen and Dickie (eds.): 91–100.
- Kallendorf, C. (ed.) (2007), *A Companion to the Classical Tradition* (Malden, MA).
- Kämmerer, T. R. (1998), *šimâ milka: Induktion und Reception der mittelbabylonischen Dichtung von Ugarit, Emār, und Tell el-'Amārna* (Münster).
- Kannicht, R. (1969), *Euripides Helena ii. Kommentar* (Heidelberg).
- Karadžić, V. S. (1841–62), *Srpske narodne pjesme i–iv* (Vienna).
- Karageorghis, J. and Karageorghis, V. (2002), 'The Great Goddess of Cyprus or the Genesis of Aphrodite in Cyprus', in S. Parpola and R. M. Whiting (eds.), *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 47th Rencontre assyriologique internationale, July 2–6, 2001* (Helsinki): 263–82.
- Katičić, R. (1998), 'Zu Erscheinungsformen und Typologie südslawischer Epik', *WS* 111: 7–44.
- Keaney, J. J. and Lamberton, R. (1996), *[Plutarch]: Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer* (Atlanta, GA).
- Kelly, A. (2006), 'Neoanalysis and the Nestorbedrängnis: A Test Case', *Hermes* 134: 1–25.
- Kelly, A. (2007), *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer, Iliad VIII* (Oxford).
- Kelly, A. (2008), 'The Babylonian Captivity of Homer: The Case of the *Dios Apate*', *Rheinisches Museum* 151: 259–304.
- Kelly, A. (2012), 'The Mourning of Thetis: "Allusion" and the Future in the *Iliad*', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 221–65.
- Kelly, A. (2015a), 'Stesichorus' Homer', in Finglass and Kelly (eds.): 21–44.
- Kelly, A. (2015b), '*Ilias parva*', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 318–43.
- Kennedy, D. (1997), 'Virgilian Epic', in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge): 145–54.
- Kerkhecker, A. (1999), *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford).
- Kern, O. (1922), *Orphicorum fragmenta* (Berlin).
- Keydell, R. (1949/50), 'Seneca und Cicero bei Quintus von Smyrna', *WJA* 4: 81–8.
- Kienast, B. (2003), *iškar šēlebi: Die Serie vom Fuchs* (Stuttgart).
- Kirk, G. S. (1960), 'Homer and Modern Oral Poetry: Some Confusions', *CQ* 10: 271–81.

- Kirk, G. S. (1962), *The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge).
- Kirk, G. S. (1972), 'Greek Mythology: Some New Perspectives', *JHS* 92: 74–85.
- Kirk, G. S. (1976), *Homer and the Oral Tradition* (Cambridge).
- Kirk, G. S. (1985), *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 1: books 1–4* (Cambridge).
- Kirk, G. S. (1990), *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 2: books 5–8* (Cambridge).
- Kirk, G. S., Raven, J. E., and Schofield, M. (1983), *The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a Selection of Texts* (Cambridge, 2nd edn).
- Kirkwood, G. (1982), *Selections from Pindar. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (Chico, CA).
- Klein, J. (1981), *Three Šulgi Hymns: Sumerian Royal Hymns Glorifying King Šulgi of Ur* (Ramat-Gan, Israel).
- Knauer, G. N. (1964), *Die Aeneis und Homer: Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis* (Göttingen).
- Knauer, G. N. (1990), 'Vergil's Aeneid and Homer', in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford): 390–412; first published: *GRBS* 5 (1964): 61–84.
- Knox, B. M. W. (1964), *The Heroic Temper. Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Köhnken, A. (1985), "'Meilichos orga". Liebesthematik und aktueller Sieg in der neunten pythischen Ode Pindars', in A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare* (Geneva) = *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt* 31: 71–116.
- Kolb, F. (1977), 'Die Bau-, Religions- und Kulturpolitik der Peisistratiden', *JdI* 92: 99–138.
- Konstan, D. (2009), 'Meleager's Sweet Tears: Observations on Weeping and Pleasure', in Fögen (ed.): 311–34.
- Kopff, E. (1981), 'Virgil and the Cyclical Epics', *ANRW* ii.31.2: 919–47.
- Korenjak, M. (1997), 'Têlikleitê Ariadnê: Exemplum mit Folgen', *WS* 110: 19–25.
- Korenjak, M. (1998), 'Homerische Intertextualität ohne Formeln? Zwei phorminx-spielende Helden in Ilias und Odyssee', *MD* 133–43.
- Kossatz-Deissmann, A. (1981), 'Achilleus', *LIMC* I.i.37–200.
- Kossatz-Deissmann, A. (1992), 'Memnon', *LIMC* VI.i.448–61.
- Kouremenos, T., Parássoglou, G. M., and Tsantsanoglou, K. (2006), *The Derveni Papyrus* (Florence).
- Kraus, C. S. (1991), 'Λόγος μὲν ἐστ' ἀρχαῖος: Stories and Story-Telling in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*', *TAPhA* 121: 75–98.
- Krebernik, M. (2003), 'Drachennutter und Himmelsrebe? Zur Frühgeschichte Dumuzis', in W. Sallaberger, K. Volk, and A. Zgoll (eds.), *Literatur, Politik und Recht in Mesopotamien. Festschrift für Claus Wilcke* (Wiesbaden): 151–80.
- Krischer, T. (1971), *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik* (Munich).
- Krischer, T. (1990), 'Mündlichkeit und epischer Sänger im Kontext der frühgeschichte Griechenlands', in W. Kullmann and M. Reichel (eds.), *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen* (Tübingen): 51–63.
- Krüger, A. (1938), 'Die orphische *κάθοδος τῆς κόρης*', *Hermes* 73: 352–5.
- Krummen, E. (2008), "'Jenen sang seine Lieder der ruhmvolle Sänger...". Moderne Erzähltheorie und die Funktion der Sängerszenen in der Odyssee', *A&A* 54: 11–41.
- Kuiper, K. (1896–8), *Studia Callimachea* i–ii (Leiden).
- Kullmann, W. (1955), 'Die Probe des Achaierheeres in der Ilias', *MH* 12: 253–73 = Kullmann 1992: 38–63.

- Kullmann, W. (1956), *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias: Untersuchungen zur Frage der Entstehung des homerischen 'Götterapparats'* (Berlin).
- Kullmann, W. (1960), *Die Quellen der Ilias* (Wiesbaden).
- Kullmann, W. (1968), 'Vergangenheit und Zukunft in der Ilias', *Poetica* 2: 15–37 = Kullmann 1992: 219–42.
- Kullmann, W. (1977), review of A. Dihle, *Homer-Probleme*, *Gnomon* 49: 529–43 = Kullmann 1992: 198–215.
- Kullmann, W. (1981), 'Zur Methode der Neoanalyse in der Homerforschung', *WS* 94 (n.s. 15): 5–42 = Kullmann 1992: 67–99.
- Kullmann, W. (1984), 'Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research', *GRBS* 25: 307–23 = Kullmann 1992: 140–55.
- Kullmann, W. (1991), 'Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer', in J. Latacz (ed.), *200 Jahre Homerforschung—Rückblick und Ausblick* (Stuttgart): 425–55 = Kullmann 1992: 100–34.
- Kullmann, W. (1992), *Homerische Motive: Beiträge zur Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung von Ilias und Odyssee* (Stuttgart).
- Kullmann, W. (1993), 'Festgehaltene Kenntnisse im Schiffskatalog und im Troerkatalog der Ilias', in W. Kullmann and J. Althof (eds.), *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur = ScriptOralia* 61 (Tübingen): 129–47 = Kullmann 2002: 9–26.
- Kullmann, W. (1995), 'The Two Nekyiai of the *Odyssey* and their Oral Sources', in M. Pasi-Apostopoulou (ed.), *EYXHN OΔΨΣΣΕΙ. Από τα Πρακτικά του Ζ' Συνεδρίου για την Οδύσσεια* (3–8 Σεπτεμβρίου 1993) (Ithaca): 41–52 = Kullmann 2002: 147–54.
- Kullmann, W. (2002), 'Nachlese zur Neoanalyse', in Kullmann 2002: 162–76.
- Kullmann, W. (2002), *Realität, Imagination und Theorie: Kleine Schriften zu Epos und Tragödie in der Antike* (Stuttgart).
- Kullmann, W. (2005), 'Ilias und Aithiopsis', *Hermes* 133: 9–28.
- Kullmann, W. (2009), 'Poesie, Mythos und Realität im Schiffskatalog der *Ilias*', *Hermes* 137: 1–20.
- Kullmann, W. (2012a), 'The Relative Chronology of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships and of the Lists of Heroes and Cities within the Catalogue', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 210–23.
- Kullmann, W. (2012b), 'Neoanalysis between Orality and Literacy: Some Remarks Concerning the Development of Greek Myths Including the Legend of the Capture of Troy', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 13–25.
- Kullmann, W. (2015), 'Motif and Source Research: Neoanalysis, Homer, and Cyclic Epic', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 108–25.
- Kurke, L. (2011), *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose* (Princeton, NJ).
- Labat, R. (1970), *Les religions du Proche-Orient asiatique: Textes babyloniens, ougaritiques, hittites* (Paris).
- Laks, A. and Most, G. W. (eds.) (1997), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford).
- Laks, A. and Most, G. W. (1997), 'Provisional Translation of the Derveni Papyrus', in Laks and Most (eds.): 9–22.
- Lambert, W. G. (1986), 'Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation,' in K. Hecker and W. Sommerfeld (eds.), *Keilschriftliche Literaturen: Ausgewählte*

- Vorträge der XXXII. Rencontre assyriologique internationale, Münster, 8–12.7.1985 (Berlin): 55–60.
- Lambert, W. G. (1991), review of S. Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia* (see Dalley 2000), CR 105 n.s. 41: 113–15.
- Lamberton, R. (1986), *Homer the Theologian. Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Lamberton, R. (1988), *Hesiod* (New Haven, CT and London).
- Lane Fox, R. (2008), *Travelling Heroes. Greeks and their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer* (London).
- Langholf, V. (2006), 'ταρχύ(ω)', *Lfgre* xxi.323–4.
- Lapinkivi, P. (2004), *The Sumerian Sacred Marriage in the Light of Comparative Evidence = State Archive of Assyria Studies* xv (Helsinki).
- Lapinkivi, P. (2010), *The Neo-Assyrian Myth of Ištar's Descent and Resurrection* (Helsinki).
- Larson, J. (2001), *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore* (Oxford).
- Latacz, J. (2000), *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar: Band 1, 1. Gesang, Faszikel 2: Kommentar* (Munich and Leipzig).
- Latacz, J. (2008), 'Rhapsodes', *BNP* xii.522–3.
- Lateiner, D. (1977), 'No Laughing Matter: A Literary Tactic in Herodotus', *TAPhA* 107: 173–82.
- Lateiner, D. (1995), *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behavior in Homeric Epic* (Ann Arbor, MI).
- Lateiner, D. (2005), 'Telemakhos' One Sneeze and Penelope's Two Laughs (*Odyssey* 17.541–50, 18.158–68), in R. J. Rabel (ed.), *Approaches to Homer, Ancient and Modern* (Swansea): 73–90.
- Lateiner, D. (2011a), 'Body Language', in Finkelberg (ed.): i.137–9.
- Lateiner, D. (2011b), 'Laughter', in Finkelberg (ed.): ii.468.
- Lateiner, D. (2011c), 'Weeping', in Finkelberg (ed.): iii.933–4.
- Lattimore, R. (1958), 'The Composition of the *History* of Herodotus', *CPh* 53: 9–21.
- Lattimore, R. (1962), *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, IL).
- Le Meur-Weissmann, N. (2008–9), 'Astyanax. Les Enfants et la guerre dans l'*Illiade*', *Gaia* 12: 29–43.
- Leick, G. (1994), *Sex and Eroticism in Mesopotamian Literature* (London).
- Lendle, O. (1957), *Die 'Pandorasage' bei Hesiod: Textkritische und motivgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Würzburg).
- Lentini, G. (2006), *Il 'padre di Telemaco': Odisseo tra Iliade e Odissea* (Pisa).
- Lenz, L. H. (1975), *Der homerische Aphroditehymnus und die Aristie des Aineias in der Ilias* (Bonn).
- Levine, D. B. (1982), 'Odyssey 18: Iros as Paradigm for the Suitors', *CJ* 77: 200–4.
- Levine, D. B. (1983), 'Penelope's Laugh: *Odyssey* 18.163', *AJPh* 104: 172–8.
- Levine, D. B. (1984), 'Odysseus' Smiles: *Odyssey* 20.301, 22.371, 23.111', *TAPhA* 114: 1–9.
- Lietz, B. (2012), *La dea di Erice e la sua diffusione nel Mediterraneo: un culto tra Fenici, Greci e Romani* (Pisa).
- Linforth, I. M. (1941), *The Arts of Orpheus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Lipiński, E. (2000), *The Aramaeans: Their Ancient History, Culture, Religion* (Louvain, Paris, and Sterling, VA).

- Llewelyn-Jones, L. and Robson, J. (2010), *Ctesias' History of Persia: Tales of the Orient* (London and New York).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1990), 'Remarks on the Homeric Question', in H. Lloyd-Jones, *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford): 3–20; first published: H. Lloyd-Jones, V. Pearl, and B. Worden (eds.), *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H. R. Trevor-Roper* (London, 1981): 15–29.
- Lohmann, D. (1970), *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (Berlin).
- Lohmann, D. (1988), *Die Andromache-Szenen der Ilias. Ansätze und Methoden der Homer-Interpretation* (Zurich).
- Lohmann, D. (1992), 'Homer als Erzähler. Die Athla im 23. Buch der Ilias', *Gymnasium* 99: 289–319.
- Longo, A. (1995), 'Sull'attribuzione della Crestomazia a Proclo neoplatonico', *SIFC* 13: 109–24.
- López-Ruiz, C. (2010), *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East* (Cambridge, MA).
- López-Ruiz, C. (2014), 'Greek and Near Eastern Mythologies: A Story of Mediterranean Encounters', in L. Edmunds (ed.), *Approaches to Greek Myth* (Baltimore, MD, 2nd edn): 154–99.
- Lord, A. B. (1953), 'Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts', *TAPhA* 84: 124–34.
- Lord, A. B. (1960), *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, MA).
- Lord, A. B. (1962), 'Homer and Other Epic Poetry', in A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings (eds.), *A Companion to Homer* (London): 179–214.
- Lord, A. B. (1972), 'The Effect of the Turkish Conquest on Balkan Epic Tradition', in H. Birnbaum and S. Vryonis (eds.), *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change* (The Hague): 298–318.
- Lord, A. B. (1981), 'Memory, Fixity, and Genre in Oral Traditional Poetries', in J. M. Foley (ed.), *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord* (Columbus, OH): 451–61.
- Lord, A. B. (1985), 'The Nature of Oral Poetry', in J. M. Foley (ed.), *Comparative Research on Oral Traditions: A Memorial for Milman Parry* (Columbus, OH): 313–49.
- Lord, A. B. (1991), *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition* (Ithaca, NY and London).
- Lord, A. B. (1991a), 'Homer as an Oral-Traditional Poet', in Lord 1991: 72–103.
- Lord, A. B. (1991b), 'The Influence of a Fixed Text', in Lord 1991: 170–85.
- Lord, A. B. (1995), *The Singer Resumes the Tale* (Ithaca, NY and London), ed. M. L. Lord.
- Louden, B. (1999), *The Odyssey: Structure, Narration and Meaning* (Baltimore, MD and London).
- Louden, B. (2006), *The Iliad: Structure, Myth, and Meaning* (Baltimore, MD).
- Louden, B. (2011), *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East* (Cambridge).
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1978), *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge).
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1983), 'Lavinia's Blush: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.64–70', *Ge&R* 30: 55–64; reprinted in Lyne 2007: 136–45.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1987), *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1989), *Words and the Poet. Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).

- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1994), 'Vergils' *Aeneid*: Subversion by Intertextuality: Catullus 66.39–40 and Other Examples', *G&R* 41: 187–204; reprinted in Lyne 2007: 167–83.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (2007), *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry* (Oxford).
- Machinist, P. (2005), 'Order and Disorder: Some Mesopotamian Reflections,' in S. Shaked (ed.), *Genesis and Regeneration: Essays on Conceptions of Origins* (Jerusalem): 31–61.
- Maciver, C. A. (2012), *Quintus Smyrnaeus' Posthomerica: Engaging Homer in Late Antiquity* (Leiden and Boston).
- Mackie, C. J. (1997), 'Achilles' Teachers: Chiron and Phoenix in the *Iliad*', *G&R* 44: 1–10.
- Mackie, H. (1997), 'Song and Story-Telling: An Odyssean Perspective', *TAPhA* 127: 77–95.
- Macleod, C. W. (1982), *Homer: Iliad, Book XXIV* (Cambridge).
- Macleod, C. W. (1983), 'Homer on Poetry and the Poetry of Homer', in C. W. Macleod, *Collected Papers* (Oxford): 1–15.
- Mader, B. (1991), 'Κήτειοι', *Lfgre* xiv.1413.
- Maehler, H. (1982), *Die Lieder des Bakchylides I: Die Siegeslieder ii: Kommentar* (Leiden).
- Maguire, L. (2009), *Helen of Troy: From Homer to Hollywood* (Chichester and Malden, MA).
- Malten, L. (1909a), 'Der Raub der Kore', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 12: 285–312.
- Malten, L. (1909b), 'Altorphische Demetersage', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 12: 417–46.
- Mann, R. (1994), 'Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths', *GRBS* 35: 313–37.
- Margalit, B. (1989), *The Ugaritic Poem of AQHT. Text, Translation, Commentary* (Berlin and New York).
- Markantonatos, A. (2007), *Oedipus at Colonus. Sophocles, Athens, and the World* (Berlin and New York).
- Marks, J. (2005), 'The Ongoing *Neikos*: Thersites, Odysseus and Achilles', *AJPh* 126: 1–31.
- Marks, J. (2008), *Zeus in the Odyssey* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Marks, J. (2010), 'Context as Hypertext: Divine Rescue Scenes in the *Iliad*', in Tsagalis (ed.): 300–22.
- Martin, R. P. (1989), *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca, NY and London).
- Martin, R. P. (2000), 'Wrapping Homer Up: Cohesion, Discourse, and Deviation in the *Iliad*', in Sharrock and Morales (eds.): 43–65.
- Martin, R. P. (2005), 'Pulp Epic: The *Catalogue* and the *Shield*', in Hunter (ed.): 153–75.
- Martin, R. P. (2011a), 'Composition-in-performance' in Finkelberg (ed.): i.173–4.
- Martin, R. P. (2011b), 'Self-Referentiality', in Finkelberg (ed.): iii.787–8.
- Martin, R. P. (2013), review of Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis 2012, *BMCRev* 2013.09.21.
- Martindale, C. (1993), *Redeeming the Text. Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge).
- Martindale, C. (ed.) (1997), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge).

- Mastronarde, D. J. (1994), *Euripides Phoenissae* (Cambridge).
- Mastronarde, D. J. (2002), *Euripides Medea* (Cambridge).
- Matasović, R. (1996), 'Greek Parallels to a Reconstruction of Balto-Slavic Mythological Texts', *WS* 109: 31–43.
- Matijević, K. (2013), review of Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis 2012, *Frankfurter elektronische Rundschau zur Altertumskunde* (<http://www.fera-journal.eu>) 21: 42–51.
- Mazur, P. S. (2010–11), 'Formulaic and Thematic Allusions in *Iliad* 9 and *Odyssey* 14', *CW* 104: 3–15.
- Meier-Brügger, M. (ed.) (2012), *Homer, gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon. Akten des Hamburger Kolloquiums vom 6.–8. Oktober 2010 zum Abschluss des Lexikons des frühgriechischen Epos* (Berlin and Boston).
- Meltzer, G. S. (1990), 'The Role of Comic Perspectives in Shaping Homer's Tragic Vision', *CW* 83: 265–80.
- Merkelbach, R. (1969), *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee* (Munich).
- Merry, W. W. and †Riddle, J. (1886), *Homer's Odyssey: Books i–xii* (Oxford).
- Mess, A. v. (1901), 'Der Typhonmythus bei Pindar und Aeschylus', *RhM* 56: 167–74.
- Metcalf, C. (2015), *The Gods Rich in Praise: Early Greek and Mesopotamian Religious Poetry* (Oxford).
- Michalowski, P. (2004), 'Sumerian', in R. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (Cambridge): 19–59.
- Michelakis, P. (2006), *Euripides: Iphigeneia at Aulis* (London).
- Michellini, A. N. (1989), 'Neophron and Euripides' *Medeia* 1056–80', *TAPhA* 119: 115–35.
- Michell, L. (2007), *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Swansea).
- Mills, S. (1997), *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford).
- Minchin, E. (2005), 'Homer on Autobiographical Memory: The Case of Nestor', in R. J. Rabel (ed.), *Approaches to Homer: Ancient and Modern* (Swansea): 55–72.
- Miralles, C. (1994), 'Laughter in the *Odyssey*', in Jäkel and Timonen (eds.): i.15–22.
- Mitchell, B. and Robinson, F. C. (1998), *Beowulf: An Edition with Relevant Shorter Texts* (Oxford).
- Momigliano, A. (1975), *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge).
- Mondi, R. (1990), 'Greek Mythic Thought in the Light of the Near East', in L. Edmunds (ed.), *Approaches to Greek Myth* (Baltimore, MD and London): 141–98.
- Monro, D. B. (1883), 'On the Fragment of Proclus' Abstract of the Epic Cycle Contained in the Codex Venetus of the *Iliad*', *JHS* 4: 305–34.
- Monro, D. B. (1901), *Homer's Odyssey XIII–XXIV* (Oxford).
- Monsacré, H. (1984), *Les Larmes d'Achille: Le Héros, la femme et la souffrance dans la poésie d'Homère* (Paris).
- Montanari, F. (1995), 'The Mythographus Homericus', in J. G. Abbenes, S. R. Slings, and I. Sluiter (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of D. M. Schenkeveld* (Amsterdam): 135–72.
- Montanari, F. (2002), 'Ancora sul Mythographus Homericus (e l'*Odissea*)', in Hurst and Létoublon (eds.): 129–44.
- Montanari, F., Rengakos, A., and Tsagalis, C. (eds.) (2009), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod* (Leiden).

- Montanari, F., Rengakos, A., and Tsagalis, C. (eds.) (2012), *Homeric Contexts: Neo-analysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry = Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes 12* (Berlin and Boston).
- Moran, W. S. (1975), 'Μυνησκομαι and "Remembering" Epic Stories in Homer and the Hymns', *QUCC* 20: 195–211.
- Morand, A.-F. (2001), *Études sur les Hymnes orphiques* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne).
- Morgan, L. (1999), *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's Georgics* (Cambridge).
- Morris, I. and Powell, B. (eds.) (1997), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden).
- Morris, S. P. (1992), *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton, NJ).
- Morris, S. P. (1997), 'Homer and the Near East', in I. Morris and Powell (eds.): 599–623.
- Morrison, A. D. (2007a), *The Narrator in Archaic and Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Morrison, A. D. (2007b), *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (London).
- Morrison, J. V. (1992a), *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad* (Ann Arbor, MI).
- Morrison, J. V. (1992b), 'Alternatives to the Epic Tradition: Homer's Challenges in the *Iliad*', *TAPhA* 122: 61–71.
- Morrison, J. V. (1997), 'Kerostasia, the Dictates of Fate, and the Will of Zeus in the *Iliad*', *Arethusa* 30: 273–96.
- Morrison, J. V. (2005), 'Similes for Odysseus and Penelope: Mortality, Divinity, Identity', in Rabel (ed.): 73–89.
- Mossman, J. (1995), *Wild Justice: A Study of Euripides' Hecuba* (Oxford).
- Mossman, J. (2011), *Euripides' Medea* (Warminster).
- Most, G. W. (1992), 'Il poeta nell'Ade: catabasi epica e teoria dell'epos', *SIFC* 85 (n.s. 10): 1014–26.
- Most, G. W. (1993), 'Hesiod and the Textualization of Personal Temporality', in G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari (eds.), *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario* (Pisa): 73–92.
- Most, G. W. (2003), 'Violets in Crucibles: Translating, Traducing, Transmuting', *TAPhA* 133: 381–90.
- Most, G. W. (2006), *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia* (Cambridge, MA).
- Most, G. W. (2012), 'Poet and Public: Communicative Strategies in Pindar and Bacchylides', in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.): 249–76.
- Motzkus, D. (1964), 'Untersuchungen zum 9. Buch der Ilias unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Phoinixgestalt' (Diss. Hamburg).
- Moulton, C. (1977), *Similes in the Homeric Poems* (Göttingen).
- Mueller, M. (1984), *The Iliad* (London, 1st edn).
- Mueller, M. (2009), *The Iliad* (London, 2nd edn).
- Mueller, M. (2011), 'Repetitions', in Finkelberg (ed.): iii.739–42.
- Mühlestein, H. (1969), 'Redende Personennamen bei Homer', *SMEA* 9: 67–94 = Mühlestein 1987: 67–94.
- Mühlestein, H. (1984), 'Der göttliche Sauhirt und die Namen', *A&A* 30: 146–53 = Mühlestein 1987: 153–60.
- Mühlestein, H. (1986), 'Ein Halbvers und einige Epitheta aus vorhomerischer Dichtung', *MH* 43: 209–20 = Mühlestein 1987: 174–85.

- Mühlestein, H. (1987), *Homerische Namenstudien* (Frankfurt a. M.).
- Müllder, D. (1910), *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen* (Berlin).
- Murnaghan, S. (1995), 'The Plan of Athena', in B. Cohen (ed.), *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey* (New York and Oxford): 61–80.
- Murnaghan, S. (1997), 'Equal Honor and Future Glory: The Plan of Zeus in the *Iliad*', in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn, and D. Fowler (eds.), *Classical Closure* (Princeton, NJ): 23–42.
- Murray, P. (1981), 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece', *JHS* 101: 87–101.
- Musäus, I. (2004), *Der Pandoramythos bei Hesiod und seine Rezeption bis Erasmus von Rotterdam. Hypomnemata 151* (Göttingen).
- Nagy, G. (1979), *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore, MD; 2nd edition, 1999).
- Nagy, G. (1982), review of W. Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (see Burkert 1985), *CPh* 77: 70–3.
- Nagy, G. (1990), 'Hesiod and the Poetics of Panhellenism' in Nagy 1990b: 36–82; first published in T. J. Luce (ed.), *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome* (New York, 1982): i.43–73.
- Nagy, G. (1990a), *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore, MD).
- Nagy, G. (1990b), *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca, NY).
- Nagy, G. (1996a), *Homeric Questions* (Austin).
- Nagy, G. (1996b), *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge).
- Nagy, G. (1998), 'Homer as "Text" and the Poetics of Cross-Reference', in C. Ehler and U. Schaefer (eds.), *Verschriftung und Verschriftlichung: Aspekte des Medienwechsels in verschiedenen Kulturen und Epochen* (Tübingen): 78–87.
- Nagy, G. (2004), *Homer's Text and Language* (Urbana, IL).
- Nagy, G. (2005), 'The Epic Hero', in Foley (ed.): 71–89.
- Nagy, G. (2009), 'Hesiod and the Ancient Biographical Traditions', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 271–311.
- Nagy, G. (2011), 'The Earliest Phases in the Reception of the *Homeric Hymns*', in Faulkner (ed.): 280–333.
- Nagy, G. (2012), 'Signs of Hero Cult in Homeric Poetry', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 27–71.
- Nagy, G. (2015), 'Oral Traditions, Written Texts, and Questions of Authorship', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 59–77.
- Nelis, D. P. (2001), 'Apollonius and Virgil', in T. D. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne): 237–59.
- Nelis, D. P. (2005), 'The Reading of Orpheus: the *Orphic Argonautica* and the Epic Tradition', in M. Paschalis (ed.) *Roman and Greek Imperial Epic* (Herakleion) 169–92.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (2011), 'Geschichte der Homerforschung', in Rengakos and Zimmermann (eds.): 175–99.
- Newman, J. K. (1967), *Augustus and the New Poetry* (Brussels).
- Nieto Hernández, P. (2011), 'Nereids', in Finkelberg (ed.): ii.570.
- Nilsson, M. P. (1932), *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).

- Nisetich, F. J. (1980), *Pindar's Victory Odes* (Baltimore, MD and London).
- Nishimura-Jensen, J. (1998), 'The Poetics of Aethalides: Silence and *Poikilia* in Apollonius' *Argonautica*', *CQ* 48: 456–69.
- Noegel, S. B. (2007), 'Greek Religion and the Ancient Near East', in D. Ogden (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Religion* (Maldon, MA): 21–37.
- Nöldeke, T. (1871), 'ΑΣΣΥΡΙΟΣ ΣΥΡΙΟΣ ΣΥΡΟΣ', *Hermes* 5: 443–68.
- Nordheider, H-W. (2010), 'Φοῖνιξ', *Lfgre* xxiv.976–81.
- Nordheider, H-W. (2012), 'Patroklos und Phoinix in der Ilias', in M. Meier-Brügger (ed.): 181–92.
- Notopoulos, J. A. (1964), 'Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry', *HSCPh* 63: 1–77.
- Nünlist, R. (2009), *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge).
- O'Donoghue, H. (1999), 'Introduction', in *Beowulf; The Fight at Finnsburh*, trans. K. Crossley-Holland (Oxford): vi–xxvi.
- O'Hara, J. J. (2007), *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan* (Cambridge).
- Oakley, J. H. (2005), *Picturing Death in Classical Athens: The Evidence of the White Lekythoi* (Cambridge).
- Obbink, D. (1997), 'Cosmology as Initiation vs. the Critique of the Orphic Mysteries', in Laks and Most (eds.): 39–54.
- Obbink, D. (2013), 'Poetry and the Mysteries', in C. A. Faraone and D. Obbink (eds.), *The Getty Hexameters: Poetry, Magic and Mystery in Ancient Selinous* (Oxford): 171–84.
- Olson, S. D. (1995), *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey* (Leiden).
- Olson, S. D. (2007), *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy* (Oxford).
- Olson, S. D. (2012), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and Related Texts: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Berlin).
- Opelt, I. (1962), 'Epitome', *RAC* v.944–73.
- Ormand, K. (2014), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women and Archaic Greece* (Cambridge).
- Osborne, R. (1993), 'À la grecque', *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 6: 231–7.
- Osborne, R. (1996), *Greece in the Making, 1200–479 B.C.* (London).
- Page, D. L. (1955), *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford).
- Page, D. L. (1959), *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Page, D. L. (1961), review of Kullmann 1960, *CR* 11: 205–9.
- Paisi-Apostopoulou, M. (ed.) (2001), *Eranos. Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on the Odyssey (2–7 September 2000)* (Ithaca).
- Papaioannou, S. (2002), 'Poetische Erinnerung und epische Dichtung. Nestors Rede in Ovid *Metamorphosen*, Buch 12', *Gymnasium* 109: 213–34.
- Papaioannou, S. (2007), *Redesigning Achilles: 'Recycling' the Epic Cycle in the 'Little Iliad' (Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1–13.622)* (Berlin and New York).
- Papanghelis, T. D. (1987), *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (Cambridge).
- Parca, M. G. (1991), *Ptocheia or Odysseus in Disguise at Troy (P. Köln VI 245)* (Atlanta, GA).
- Parker, R. C. T. (1983), review of Fontenrose 1981, *CR* 33: 69–71.
- Parker, R. C. T. (1991), 'The Hymn to Demeter and the Homeric Hymns', *G&R* 38: 1–17.

- Parker, R. C. T. (1995), 'Early Orphism', in A. Powell (ed.), *The Greek World* (London): 483–510.
- Parker, R. C. T. (1996), *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford).
- Parker, S. B. (1997), *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry: Writings from the Ancient World Society of Biblical Literature* (Atlanta, GA).
- Parry, A. (1966), 'Have We Homer's *Iliad*?', *YCLS* 20: 175–216; reprinted in A. Parry, *The Language of Achilles and Other Papers* (Oxford, 1989): 104–40.
- Parry, A. (1971), 'Introduction', in M. Parry 1971: ix–lxii.
- Parry, M. (1971), *The Making of Homeric Verse. The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford).
- Pasquali, G. (1951), 'Arte allusiva', *Stravaganze quarte e supreme* (Venice): 11–20; first published: *Italia che scrive* 25 (1942) 185–7.
- Patzek, B. (2011), 'Altorientalische "Textvorlagen" für die *Ilias*?', in Ulf and Rollinger (eds.): 391–407.
- Pelliccia, H. (2003), 'Two Points about Rhapsodes', in M. Finkelberg and G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (Leiden): 97–116.
- Pelling, C. B. R. (2006), 'Homer and Herodotus', in Clarke, Currie, and †Lyne (eds.): 75–104.
- Pellizer, E. (1978), 'Tecnica compositiva e struttura genealogica nell' Inno omerico ad Afrodite', *QUCC* 27: 115–44.
- Penglase, R. (1994), *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia. Parallels and Influence in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod* (London and New York).
- Peradotto, J. (1990), *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey* (Princeton, NJ).
- Perkell, C. (2008), 'Reading the Laments of *Iliad* 24', in A. Suter (ed.), *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond* (Oxford): 93–117.
- Pestalozzi, H. (1945), *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Zurich).
- Petriconi, H. (1964), 'Das "Gilgamesch-Epos" als Vorbild der *Ilias*', in A. S. Crisafulli (ed.), *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Helmut A. Hatzfeld* (Washington DC): 329–42.
- Petropoulos, I. (2012), 'The *Telemachy* and the Cyclic *Nostoi*', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 291–308.
- Pettinato, G. (2000), *Nergal ed Ereškigal. Il poema assiro-babilonese degli inferi* (Rome).
- Pfeiffer, R. (1949–53), *Callimachus i–ii* (Oxford).
- Pfeijffer, I. L. (1999), 'Bacchylides' Homer, his Tragedy, and his Pindar', in I. L. Pfeijffer and S. R. Slings (eds.), *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides* (Amsterdam): 17–29.
- Pinsent, J. (1992), 'The Odysseised *Iliad*', in J. Pinsent and H. V. Hurt (eds.), *Homer 1987: Papers of the Third Greenbank Colloquium, April 1987* (Liverpool): 75–84.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. (1994), *L'Aphrodite grecque* (Athens).
- Pironti, G. (2007), *Entre ciel et guerre: Figures d'Aphrodite en Grèce ancienne = Kernos Suppl. 18* (Liège).
- Pironti, G. (2010), 'Rethinking Aphrodite as a Goddess at Work', in Smith and Pickup (eds.): 113–30.
- Podlecki, A. J. (1971), 'Some Odyssean Similes', *G&R* 18: 81–90.
- Ponchia, S. and Luukko, M. (2013), *The Standard Babylonian Myth of Nergal and Ereškigal* (Helsinki).

- Powell, B. B. (2007), *Homer* (Malden, MA, 2nd edn).
- Powell, B. B. (2011), 'Near East and Homer', in Finkelberg (ed.): ii.559–62.
- Pucci, P. (1977), *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore, MD).
- Pucci, P. (1987), *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (Ithaca, NY).
- Pulley, S. J. (2006), 'Homer's Religion: Philological Perspectives from Indo-European and Semitic', in Clarke, Currie, and †Lyne (eds.): 47–74.
- Quattordio Moreschini, A. (1984), 'Elementi micenei nella tradizione formulare: *Γεργήνιος ἱππότα Νεστωρ*', *SMEA* 25: 337–47.
- Race, W. H. (2010), 'Horace's Debt to Pindar', in Davis (ed.): 147–73.
- Radner, K. and Robson, E. (eds.) (2011), *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture* (Oxford).
- Radt, S. (2002–11), *Strabons Geographika* i–x (Göttingen).
- Ravaglioli, S. A. (1985), 'Inarime', in *Enciclopedia virgiliana* (Rome) ii: 932.
- Redfield, J. (1979), 'The Proem of the *Iliad*: Homer's Art', *CPh* 74: 95–110; reprinted in D. L. Cairns 2001: 456–77.
- Reece, S. (1993), *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene* (Ann Arbor, MI).
- Reece, S. (1994), 'The Cretan *Odyssey*: A Lie Truer than Truth', *AJPh* 115: 157–73.
- Reece, S. (2005), 'Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: From Oral Performance to Written Text', in Amodio (ed.): 43–89.
- Reichel, M. (1992), 'Gräzistische Bemerkungen zur Struktur des Gilgamesch-Epos', in Brogyanyi and Lipp (eds.): 187–208.
- Reichel, M. (1994), *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias* (Tübingen).
- Reichel, M. (1998), 'How Oral is Homer's Narrative?', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* x, eds. F. Cairns and M. Heath: 1–22.
- Reiner, E. (1985), *Your Thwarts in Pieces, Your Mooring Rope Cut: Poetry from Babylonia and Assyria* (Ann Arbor, MI).
- Reinhardt, K. (1956), 'Zum homerischen Aphroditehymnus', in *Festschrift Bruno Snell. Zum 60. Geburtstag am 18. Juni 1956 von Freunden und Schülern überreicht* (Munich): 1–14.
- Reinhardt, K. (1960 [1938]), 'Das Parisurteil', in Reinhardt 1960: 16–36 (first published as *Das Parisurteil* (Frankfurt a. M., 1938); English translation: G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones 1997: 170–91).
- Reinhardt, K. (1960 [1948]), 'Die Abenteuer der Odyssee', in Reinhardt 1960: 47–124; first published in K. Reinhardt, *Von Werken und Formen: Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Godesberg, 1948): 52–162.
- Reinhardt, K. (1960), *Tradition und Geist. Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung* (Göttingen).
- Reinhardt, K. (1961), *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (Göttingen).
- Rengakos, A. (2007), 'The Smile of Achilles, or the *Iliad* and its Mirror-Image', in M. Pasi-Apostopoulou, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Contests and Rewards in the Homeric Epics. Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on the Odyssey (15–19 September 2004)* (Ithaca): 101–10.
- Rengakos, A. (2011), 'Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der homerischen Epen', in Rengakos and Zimmermann (eds.): 167–75.

- Rengakos, A. (2015a), 'Narrative Techniques in the Epic Cycle', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 154–63.
- Rengakos, A. (2015b), 'Aethiopsis', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 306–17.
- Rengakos, A. and Zimmermann, B. (eds.) (2011), *Homer-Handbuch: Leben-Werk-Wirkung* (Stuttgart and Weimar).
- Renger, A.-B. (2006), *Zwischen Märchen und Mythos: Die Abenteuer des Odysseus und andere Geschichten von Homer bis Walter Benjamin. Eine gattungstheoretische Studie* (Stuttgart and Weimar).
- Revermann, M. (2006), 'The Competence of Theatre Audiences in Fifth-and Fourth-Century Athens', *JHS* 126: 99–124.
- Richardson, B. (2010), 'Transtextual Characters', in J. Eder, F. Jannidis, and R. Schneider (eds.), *Characters in Fictional Worlds: Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature, Film, and Other Media* (Berlin): 527–41.
- Richardson, N. J. (1974), *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford).
- Richardson, N. J. (1985), 'Pindar and Ancient Literary Criticism', *Papers of the Liverpool International Latin Seminar* 5: 383–401.
- Richardson, N. J. (1991), 'Homer and Cyprus', in V. Karageorghis (ed.), *The Civilizations of the Aegean and their Diffusion in Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean 2000–600 BC* (Larnaca): 125–8.
- Richardson, N. J. (1993), *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 6: Books 21–24* (Cambridge).
- Richardson, N. J. (2007), 'The Homeric Hymn to Hermes', in P. J. Finglass, C. Collard, and N. J. Richardson (eds.), *Hesperos: Studies Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford): 83–94.
- Richardson, N. J. (2010), *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite* (Cambridge).
- Richardson, N. J. (2011), 'The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Some Central Questions Revisited', in Faulkner (ed.): 44–58.
- Richardson, S. (1990), *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville, TN).
- Rinon, Y. (2006), 'Mise en abyme and Tragic Signification in the *Odyssey*: The Three Songs of Demodocus', *Mnemosyne* 59: 208–25.
- Risch, E. (1965), 'ἄμφρόσιος', *Lfgre* iv.616–17.
- Rissman, L. (1983), *Love as War: Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho. Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* 157 (Königstein).
- Ritoók, Z. (1994/1995), 'Exemplum und Gleichnis', *WS* 107/108: 45–9.
- Roesch, P. (1982), *Études béotiennes* (Paris).
- Rohde, E. (1925), *Psyche* i–ii (Tübingen, 9th and 10th edns).
- Röllig, W. (2001), 'Myths about the Netherworld in the Ancient Near East and their Counterparts in the Greek Religion', in S. Ribichini, M. Rocchi, and P. Xella (eds.), *La questione delle influenze vicino-orientali sulla religione greca* (Rome): 309–14.
- Rollinger, R. (1996), 'Altorientalische Motive in der frühgriechischen Literatur am Beispiel der homerischen Epen. Elemente des Kampfes in der Ilias und in der altorientalischen Literatur (nebst Überlegungen zur Präsenz altorientalischer Wanderpriester im früharchaischen Griechenland)', in C. Ulf (ed.), *Wege zur Genese griechischer Identität. Die Bedeutung der früharchaischen Zeit* (Berlin): 156–210.
- Rollinger, R. (2001), 'The Ancient Greeks and the Impact of the Ancient Near East: Textual Evidence and Historical Perspective', in R. M. Whiting (ed.), *Mythology*

- and *Mythologies: Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences*. Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project held in Paris, France, October 4–7, 1999 (Helsinki): 233–64.
- Rollinger, R. (2006), 'The Terms "Assyria" and "Syria" again', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 65: 283–7.
- Rollinger, R. (2011), 'Altorientalische Einflüsse auf die homerischen Epen', in Rengakos and Zimmermann (eds.): 213–27.
- Rosenmeyer, T. G. (1996), 'Ironies in Serious Drama', in M. S. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic. Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford): 497–519.
- Rösler, W. (2002), 'The *Histories* and Writing', in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne): 79–94.
- Rösler, W. (2011), 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit', in Rengakos and Zimmermann (eds.): 201–13.
- Ross, D. O. (1975), *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge).
- Roszbach, O. (1893–4), 'Anchises', *RE* i: 2106–10.
- Rowe, C. J. (1978), *Essential Hesiod* (Bristol).
- Russo, J. A. (1968), 'Homer against his Tradition', *Arion* 7: 275–95.
- Russo, J. A. (1982), 'Interview and Aftermath: Dream, Fantasy and Intuition in *Odyssey* 19 and 20', *AJPh* 103: 4–18.
- Russo, J. A. (1992), 'Books XVII–XX', in Russo, Fernández-Galiano, and Heubeck 1992: 3–127.
- Russo, J. A., Fernández-Galiano, M., and Heubeck, A. (1992), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume III: Books XVII–XXIV* (Oxford).
- Rutherford, I. C. (2001), *Pindar's Paean: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford).
- Rutherford, I. C. (2009), 'Hesiod and the Literary Traditions of the Near East', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod* (Leiden): 9–35.
- Rutherford, I. C. (2012), 'The *Catalogue of Women* within the Greek Epic Tradition', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 152–67.
- Rutherford, I. C. (2015), 'Pindar's Cycle', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.): 450–60.
- Rutherford, R. B. (1985), 'At Home and Abroad: Aspects of the *Odyssey*', *PCPhS* 31: 133–50.
- Rutherford, R. B. (1986), 'The Philosophy of the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 106: 145–62; reprinted in Doherty (ed.) 2009: 155–88.
- Rutherford, R. B. (1992), *Odyssey XIX and XX* (Cambridge).
- Rutherford, R. B. (2001), 'From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*', in D. L. Cairns (ed.): 117–46; first published: *BICS* 38 (1991–3): 47–54.
- Rutherford, R. B. (2012a), *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language and Interpretation* (Cambridge).
- Rutherford, R. B. (2012b), 'Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography', in E. Foster and D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford): 13–38.
- Rutherford, R. B. (2013), *Homer* (Cambridge, 2nd edn).
- Rzach, A. (1922), 'Kyklos', *RE* xi: 2347.28–2435.6.

- Sacks, R. (1987), *The Traditional Phrase in Homer: Two Studies in Form, Meaning, and Interpretation* (Leiden).
- Saïd, S. (2011), *Homer and the Odyssey* (Oxford); first published as *Homère et l'Odyssée* (Paris, 1998).
- Saïd, S. (2012), 'Animal Similes in *Odyssey* 22', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 347–68.
- Sale, W. M. (1989), 'The Trojans, Statistics, and Milman Parry', *GRBS* 30: 341–410.
- Sale, W. M. (1996a), 'Homer and Avdo: Investigating Orality through External Consistency', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Voice into Text* (Leiden): 21–42.
- Sale, W. M. (1996b), review of J. M. Foley 1995, *BMCRev* 95.12.20.
- Sale, W. M. (2001), 'The Oral-Formulaic Theory Today', in J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes. Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne): 53–80.
- Sallaberger, W. (1999), 'Teil 2: Ur III-Zeit', in W. Sallaberger and A. Westenholz, *Mesopotamien: Akkade-Zeit und Ur III-Zeit* (Göttingen): 121–390.
- Sallaberger, W. (2008), *Das Gilgamesch-Epos: Mythos, Werk und Tradition* (Munich).
- Sammons, B. (2010), *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue* (Oxford).
- Sasson, J. M. (2005), 'Comparative Observations on the Near Eastern Epic Traditions', in J. M. Foley (ed.): 215–32.
- Sbardella, L. (1994), 'Tracce di un epos di Eracle nei poemi omerici', *SMEA* 33: 145–66.
- Sbardella, L. (2011), 'Le ossa di Antiloco: *Etiopide* e *Odissea* tra localismo e panellenismo', in A. Aloni and M. Ornaghi (eds.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: nuovi contributi* (Messina): 27–51.
- Sbardella, L. (2012a), *Cucitori di canti: studi sulla tradizione epico-rapsodica greca e i suoi itinerari nel VI secolo a. C.* (Rome).
- Sbardella, L. (2012b), 'Gli *Inni omerici*: un genere letterario autonomo? Il caso dell'*Inno ad Afrodite* e delle sue varianti rapsodiche', *SemRom* I.2: 211–34.
- Scafoglio, G. (2004a), 'Proclo e il ciclo epico', *GFA* 7: 39–57.
- Scafoglio, G. (2004b), 'La questione ciclica', *RPh* 78: 289–301.
- Scaife, R. (1995), 'The *Kypria* and Its Early Reception', *ClAnt* 14: 164–97.
- Scarpi, P. (2002), *Le religioni dei misteri. Volume I. Eleusi, dionisismo, orfismo* (Milan).
- Schadewaldt, W. (1965 [1935]), 'Hektor und Andromache', in Schadewaldt 1965: 207–33; first published: *Die Antike* 11 (1935) 149–70; partial English translation: G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones 1997: 124–42.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1965 [1952]), 'Einblick in die Erfindung der Ilias. Ilias und Memnonis', in Schadewaldt 1965: 155–202; first published in *Varia variorum: Festgabe für Karl Reinhardt, dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern zum 14. Februar 1951* (Münster and Cologne, 1952): 13–48.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1965), *Von Homers Welt und Werk* (Stuttgart, 4th edn).
- Schein, S. L. (1970), 'Odysseus and Polyphemus in the *Odyssey*', *GRBS* 11: 73–83.
- Schein, S. L. (1984), *The Mortal Hero. An Introduction to Homer's Iliad* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Schein, S. L. (1995), 'Female Representations and Interpreting the *Odyssey*', in B. Cohen (ed.), *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford): 17–27.
- Schein, S. L. (1997), 'The *Iliad*: Structure and Interpretation', in Morris and Powell (eds.): 345–59.

- Schein, S. L. (1999), 'Homeric Intertextuality: Two Examples', in J. N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis* (Stuttgart): 349–56.
- Schein, S. L. (2002), 'The Horses of Achilles in Book 17 of the *Iliad*', in M. Reichel and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Epea pteroenta. Beiträge zur Homerforschung. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart): 193–205.
- Schein, S. L. (2013), *Sophocles Philoctetes* (Cambridge).
- Schironi, F. (2009), *From Alexandria to Babylon: Near Eastern Languages and Hellenistic Erudition in the Oxyrhynchus Glossary (P.Oxy. 1802 + 4812)* (Berlin and New York).
- Schlunk, R. R. (1974), *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid: A Study of the Influence of Ancient Literary Criticism on Vergil* (Ann Arbor, MI).
- Schmidt, M. (1999), 'οἶκος', *LfgRE* xvii.565–75.
- Schmit-Neuerberg, T. (1999), *Vergils Aeneis und die antike Homerexegese* (Berlin and New York).
- Schmitz, T. A. (1994), 'Ist die Odyssee "spannend"? Anmerkungen zur Erzähltechnik des homerischen Epos', *Philologus* 138: 3–23.
- Schmitz, T. A. (2002), *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction* (Malden, MA and Oxford).
- Schmitz, T. A. (2007), 'The Use of Analepses and Prolepses in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*', in Baumbach and Bär (eds.): 65–84.
- Schoeck, G. (1961), *Ilias und Aithiopsis. Kyklische Motive in homerischer Brechung* (Zurich).
- Schwabl, H. (1982), 'Traditionelle Gestaltung, Motivwiederholung und Mimesis im homerischen Epos', *WS* 95 (n.s. 16): 13–33.
- Schwabl, H. (1986), 'Zum Problem der traditionellen Kompositionsformen bei Homer', *WS* 99 (n.s. 20): 39–62.
- Schwabl, H. (1990), 'Was lehrt die mündliche Epik für Homer?', in W. Kullmann and M. Reichel (eds.), *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen* (Tübingen): 65–109.
- Schwemer, D. (2006), 'Multilingualism. III. Ancient Near East. A. Mesopotamia/Syria / Palestine', *BNP*: ix.274–5.
- Schwinge, E. R. (1993), *Die Odyssee—nach den Odysseen: Betrachtungen zu ihrer individuellen Physiognomie* (Göttingen).
- Scodel, R. (1982), 'The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction', *HSCPh* 86: 35–50.
- Scodel, R. (1997), 'Pseudo-Intimacy and the Prior Knowledge of the Homeric Audience', *Arethusa* 30: 201–19.
- Scodel, R. (2001), 'Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition in Hesiod and Pindar', in J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne): 109–37.
- Scodel, R. (2002), *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative and Audience* (Ann Arbor, MI).
- Scodel, R. (2004), 'The Story-teller and his Audience', in R. L. Fowler (ed.): 45–55.
- Scodel, R. (2007), 'Lycurgus and the State Text of Tragedy', in C. Cooper (ed.), *Politics of Orality* (Leiden): 129–54.
- Scodel, R. (2008), 'Stupid, Pointless Wars', *TAPhA* 138: 219–35.
- Scodel, R. (2012), 'Hesiod and the Epic Cycle', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 501–15.

- Scott, W. C. (1974), *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile* (Leiden).
- Scott, W. C. (2009), *The Artistry of the Homeric Simile* (Hanover, NH).
- Scully, S. E. (1990), *Homer and the Sacred City* (Ithaca, NY and London).
- Seaford, R. (1994), *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Oxford).
- Sefati, Y. (1998), *Love Songs in Sumerian Literature. Critical Edition of the Dumuzi-Inanna Songs* (Jerusalem).
- Segal, C. (1971), 'Andromache's Anagnorisis: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22.437–476', *HSCPh* 75: 33–57.
- Segal, C. (1992), 'Bard and Audience in Homer', in R. Lamberton (ed.), *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes* (Princeton, NJ): 3–29.
- Segal, C. (1994), *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey* (Ithaca, NY).
- Segal, C. (1997), *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides' Bacchae* (Princeton, NJ, 2nd edn).
- Sergent, B. (2002), 'Les Phéaciens avant l'*Odyssée*', in Hurst and Létoublon (eds.): 199–222.
- Setaioli, A. (1988), 'Pindaro', in *Enciclopedia virgiliana* (Rome): iv.107–11.
- Severyns, A. (1928), *Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (Liège).
- Severyns, A. (1938–63), *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus i–iv* (Paris).
- Severyns, A. (1965), *Sur le début des Chants cypriens* (Amsterdam) = *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* no. 5: 285–97.
- Shapiro, H. A. (1994), *Myth into Art: Poet and Painter in Classical Greece* (London).
- Siegelová, J. (1971), *Appu-Märchen und Hedammu-Mythus* (Wiesbaden).
- Silk, M. S., Gildenhard, I., and Barrow, R. (eds.) (2014), *The Classical Tradition: Art, Literature, Thought* (Malden, MA).
- Silk, M. S. (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery with Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Simon, E. (1992), 'Neues zu den Mythen von Aineias, Sarpedon und Itys in der etruskischen Kunst', *AA*: 233–42.
- Sinclair, T. A. (1932), *Hesiod Works and Days* (London).
- Singer, H. W. (1992), 'The Achaean Wall and the Seven Gates of Thebes', *Hermes* 120: 401–11.
- Slater, W. J. (1969), *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin).
- Slatkin, L. M. (1991), *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad* (Berkeley, CA and Oxford).
- Slatkin, L. M. (2001), 'The Wrath of Thetis', in D. L. Cairns (2001): 409–34; first published: *TAPhA* 116 (1986): 1–24.
- Smith, A. C. and Pickup, S. (eds.) (2010), *Brill's Companion to Aphrodite* (Leiden and Boston).
- Smith, P. (1981a), *Nursling of Mortality: A Study of the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (Frankfurt a. M.).
- Smith, P. (1981b), 'Aineiadai as Patrons of *Iliad* XX and of the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite', *HSCPh* 85: 17–59.
- Smith, R. S. and Trzaskoma, S. M. (2007), *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae: Two Handbooks of Greek Mythology* (Indianapolis, IN).
- Snodgrass, A. M. (1998), *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art* (Cambridge).

- Sommerstein, A. H. (2006), 'Syndeipnoi', in A. H. Sommerstein, D. Fitzpatrick, and T. Talbot, *Sophocles: Selected Fragmentary Plays* (Warminster): 84–140.
- Sotiriou, M. (1998), *Pindarus Homericus: Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien* (Göttingen).
- Sowa, C. A. (1984), *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* (Chicago).
- Stanley, E. G. (1987), 'The Germanic "Heroic Lay" of Finnesburg', in E. G. Stanley, A. *Collection of Papers with Emphasis on Old English Literature* (Toronto): 281–97.
- Steiner, D. (2010), *Homer Odyssey Books XVII and XVIII* (Cambridge).
- Steymans, H. U. (2010), 'Gilgamesh im Westen', in H. U. Steymans (ed.), *Gilgamesch: Ikonographie eines Helden/Gilgamesh: Epic and Iconography* (Göttingen): 287–345.
- Stinton, T. C. W. (1990), 'Euripides and the Judgement of Paris', in T. C. W. Stinton, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (London): 17–75; first published: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies Supplementary Paper 11 (1965).
- Stoeverstandt, M. (2008), *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar Band IV Sechster Gesang (Z)* (Berlin and New York).
- Stoneman, R. (1976), 'Mythology and Interpretation. Two Notes on Pindar's *Nemean*s', *Maia* 28: 227–32.
- Stoneman, R. (1981), 'Pindar and the Mythological Tradition', *Philologus* 125: 44–63.
- Storey, I. C. (2003), *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford).
- Streck, M. (1916), *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Nineveh's ii Texte: Die Inschriften Assurbanipals und der letzten assyrischen Könige* (Leipzig).
- Strecker, G. (1962), 'Entrückung', *RAC* 5: 461–76.
- Suter, A. (2009), 'Tragic Tears and Gender', in Fögen (ed.): 59–83.
- Taplin, O. (1990), 'The Earliest Quotation of the *Iliad*?', in E. M. Craik (ed.), *Owls to Athens* (Oxford): 109–12.
- Taplin, O. (1992), *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad* (Oxford).
- Taplin, O. (1999), 'Spreading the Word through Performance', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge): 33–57.
- Tarrant, R. (2012), *Virgil Aeneid Book XII* (Cambridge).
- Teffeteller, A. (2010), 'The Song of Ares and Aphrodite: Ašertu on Skheria', in Smith and Pickup (eds.): 133–49.
- Teodorsson, S.-T. (2006), 'Eastern Literacy, Greek Alphabet, and Homer', *Mnemosyne* 59: 161–87.
- Thalmann, W. G. (1984), *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore, MD and London).
- Thieme, P. (1952), 'Ambrosia', *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, vol. 98, instalment 5 (Berlin): 15–34.
- Thomas, O. (2011), 'The Homeric Hymn to Pan', in Faulkner (ed.): 151–72.
- Thomas, O. (forthcoming), 'Sparring Partners: Fraternal Relations in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes', in P. Basson, L. G. Canevaro, and B. Graziosi (eds.), *Conflict and Consensus in Early Hexameter Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Thomas, R. (2004), 'Greek Medicine and Babylonian Wisdom: Circulation of Knowledge and Channels of Transmission in the Archaic and Classical Periods',

- in H. F. J. Horstmannshoff and M. Stol (eds.), *Magic and Rationality in Ancient Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman Medicine* (Leiden and Boston): 175–85.
- Thomas, R. F. (1986), 'Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference', *HSCPh* 90: 171–98.
- Thomas, R. F. (1988), *Virgil, Georgics i–ii* (Cambridge).
- Thomas, R. F. (1999), 'Virgil's Pindar?', in R. F. Thomas, *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor, MI): 267–87.
- Thomas, R. F. and Ziolkowski, J. M. (eds.) (2013), *The Virgil Encyclopedia i–iii* (Malden, MA).
- Thompson, S. (1955–8), *A Motif-Index of Folk-Literature i–vi* (Bloomington, IN).
- Thornton, A. (1984), *Homer's Iliad: Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication* (Göttingen).
- Tigay, J. H. (1982), *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia, PA).
- Tigay, J. H. (1993), 'On Evaluating Claims of Literary Borrowing', in M. E. Cohen, D. C. Snell, and D. B. Weisberg (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo* (Bethesda, MD): 250–5.
- Torrance, I. (2013), *Metapoetry in Euripides* (Oxford).
- Torres-Guerra, J. B. (1995), *La Tebaida homérica como fuente de Iliada y Odisea* (Madrid).
- Treadgold, W. T. (1980), *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington DC).
- Tsagalis, C. (2008), *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics* (Washington DC).
- Tsagalis, C. (2011), 'Towards an Oral, Intertextual Neoanalysis', *Trends in Classics* 3.2: 209–44.
- Tsagalis, C. (2012), 'Deauthorizing the Epic Cycle: Odysseus' False Tale to Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.199–359)', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 309–45.
- Tsagalis, C. (ed.) (2014), *Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic = Trends in Classics* (Special Issue) 6.2 (Berlin, Munich, and Boston).
- Tsagalis, C. (2014a), 'Preface', in Tsagalis (ed.): 239–46.
- Tsagalis, C. (2014b), 'γυναικῶν εἴνεκα δώρων: Interformularity and Intertraditionality in Theban and Homeric Epic', in Tsagalis (ed.): 357–98.
- Tsomis, G. P. (2007), 'Vorbild und *aemulatio*: An der Kreuzung von intertextuellen Bezügen in den Totenklagen dreier Frauen in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*: Briseis, Tekmessa und Oinone', in Baumbach and Bär (eds.): 185–207.
- Turkeltaub, D. (2005), 'Reading the Past: The *Iliad* on Heroic Epic', in P. Mitsis and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Allusion, Authority, and Truth: Critical Perspectives on Greek Poetic and Rhetorical Praxis* (Berlin and New York): 129–52.
- Ulf, C. and Rollinger, R. (eds.) (2011), *Lag Troia in Kilikien? Der aktuelle Streit um Homers Ilias* (Darmstadt).
- Usener, K. (1990), *Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der Odyssee zur Ilias* (Tübingen).
- van 't Wout, P. E. (2006), 'Amphiaraus as Alkman: Compositional Strategy and Mythological Innovation in Pindar's *Pythian* 8.39–60', *Mnemosyne* 59: 1–18.
- Van Thiel, H. (1979), 'Telemachie und *Odyssee*', *MH* 36: 65–89.
- van Wees, H. (1998), 'A Brief History of Tears: Gender Differentiation in Archaic Greece', in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds.), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity* (London and New York): 10–53.
- Vanstiphout, H. L. J. (1986), 'Some remarks on Cuneiform écritures,' in H. L. J. Vanstiphout (ed.), *Scripta signa vocis: Studies about Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes,*

- and *Languages in the Near East, Presented to J. H. Hespers by his Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends* (Groningen) 217–34.
- Verdenius, W. J. (1970), *Homer, the Educator of the Greeks* (Amsterdam and London).
- Verdenius, W. J. (1985), *A Commentary on Hesiod Works and Days*, vv. 1–382 (Leiden).
- Vermeule, E. (1979), *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Vian, F. (1959), *Recherches sur les Posthomeric de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris).
- Vian, F. (1960), 'Le Mythe de Typhée et le problème de ses origines orientales', in O. Eissfeldt (ed.), *Éléments orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienne. Colloque de Strasbourg 22–24 mai 1958* (Paris): 17–37.
- Vian, F. (1963), *Quintus de Smyrne: La Suite d'Homère*, i (Paris).
- Vian, F. (1987), *Les Argonautiques orphiques* (Paris).
- Vogelzang, M. E. and Vanstiphout, H. L. J. (eds.) (1992), *Mesopotamian Epic Literature: Oral or Aural* (Lewiston, NY).
- Volk, K. (1995), *Inanna und Šukaletuda: Zur historisch-politischen Deutung eines sumerischen Literaturwerkes* (Wiesbaden).
- Volk, K. (2002), *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manlius* (Oxford).
- von Kamptz, H. (1982), *Homerische Personennamen. Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation* (Göttingen).
- von Scheliha, R. (1943), *Patroklos: Gedanken über Homers Dichtung und Gestalten* (Basle).
- Wachter, R. (2012), 'The Other View: Focus on Linguistic Innovations in the Homeric Epics', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 65–79.
- Walcot, P. (1966), *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff).
- Walcot, P. (1991), 'The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: A Literary Appraisal', *G&R* 38: 137–55.
- Walls, N. H. (1992), *The Goddess Anat in Ugaritic Myth* (Atlanta, GA).
- Walls, N. H. (2001), *Desire, Discord and Death: Approaches to Ancient Near Eastern Myth* (Boston).
- Watkins, C. (1995), *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (Oxford).
- Weiss, C. (1986), 'Eos: IV Eos und Memnon'. *LIMC* III.i.779–88.
- Welcker, F. G. (1865–82), *Der epische Cyclus, oder die homerischen Dichter* i–ii (Bonn).
- West, M. L. (1966), *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (1969), 'Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature', *HSCPh* 73: 113–34.
- West, M. L. (1978), *Hesiod Works and Days* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (1981), 'Is the *Works and Days* an Oral Poem?', in C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, and C. O. Pavese (eds.), *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale*. Atti del convegno di Venezia, 28–30 settembre 1977 (Padua): 53–67 = M. L. West 2011b: 146–58.
- West, M. L. (1983), *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (1985), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (1987), *Euripides Orestes* (Warminster).
- West, M. L. (1988), 'The Rise of the Greek Epic', *JHS* 108: 151–72 = M. L. West 2011b: 35–73.

- West, M. L. (1995), 'The Date of the *Iliad*', *MH* 52: 203–19 = M. L. West 2011b: 188–208.
- West, M. L. (1997), *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (1998), 'The Textual Criticism and Editing of Homer', in G. W. Most (ed.), *Editing Texts/Texte editieren* (Göttingen): 94–110.
- West, M. L. (1998–2000), *Homeri Ilias* i–ii (Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- West, M. L. (1999), 'The Invention of Homer', *CQ* 49: 364–82 = M. L. West 2011b: 408–36.
- West, M. L. (2000a), '*Iliad* and *Aethiopis* on Stage: Aeschylus and Son', *CQ* 50: 338–52.
- West, M. L. (2000b), 'The Name of Aphrodite', *Glotta* 76: 134–8.
- West, M. L. (2001), response to G. Nagy and J.-F. Nardelli, *BMCRev* 2001.09.06 = M. L. West 2011b: 176–81.
- West, M. L. (2001a), *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Leipzig and Munich).
- West, M. L. (2001b), 'The Fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysus', *ZPE* 134: 1–11.
- West, M. L. (2002), 'The View from Lesbos', in Reichel and Rengakos (eds.): 201–19 = M. L. West 2011b: 392–407.
- West, M. L. (2003a), *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, MA).
- West, M. L. (2003b), '*Iliad* and *Aethiopis*'. *CQ* 53: 1–14 = M. L. West 2011b: 242–64.
- West, M. L. (2003c), *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer* (Cambridge, MA).
- West, M. L. (2004), response to A. Rengakos and G. Nagy, *BMCRev* 2004.04.17.
- West, M. L. (2005), '*Odyssey* and *Argonautica*', *CQ* 55: 39–64 = M. L. West 2011b: 277–312.
- West, M. L. (2006), 'Archilochus and Telephos', *ZPE* 156: 11–17.
- West, M. L. (2007), *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (2011a), *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (2011b), *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought. Volume I: Epic* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (2011c), 'The First Homeric Hymn to Dionysus', in Faulkner (ed.): 29–43.
- West, M. L. (2011d), 'Pindar as a Man of Letters', in D. Obbink and R. B. Rutherford (eds.), *Culture in Pieces. Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford): 50–68.
- West, M. L. (2011e), 'Magnes of Smyrna: A Greek Poet at the Court of Gyges', in M. L. West 2011b: 344–52.
- West, M. L. (2011f), 'Gilgamesh', in Finkelberg (ed.): i.313–14.
- West, M. L. (2011g), 'Interpolations', in Finkelberg (ed.): ii.411–13.
- West, M. L. (2011h), 'Rhapsodes (ῥαψωδοί)', in Finkelberg (ed.): iii.745–6.
- West, M. L. (2012), 'Towards a Chronology of Early Greek Epic', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 224–41.
- West, M. L. (2013), *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford).
- West, M. L. (2014), *The Making of the Odyssey* (Oxford).
- West, S. R. (1981), 'An Alternative Nostos for Odysseus', *LCM* 6: 169–75.
- West, S. R. (1988), 'Books I–IV', in Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988: 51–245.

- West, S. R. (1994), 'Prometheus Orientalized', *MH* 51: 129–49.
- West, S. R. (2001), 'Phoenix's Antecedents: A Note on *Iliad* 9', *SCI* 20: 1–15.
- West, S. R. (2012a), 'Odyssean Stratigraphy', in Andersen and Haug (eds.): 122–37.
- West, S. R. (2012b), 'Some Reflections on *Alpamysh*', in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.): 531–41.
- Westerink, L. G.† and Combès, J. (1991), *Damascius. Traité des premiers principes* iii (Paris).
- Whallon, W. (1969), *Formula, Character and Context: Studies in Homeric, Old English, and Old Testament Poetry* (Washington, DC).
- Whallon, W. (2000), 'How the Shroud for Laertes Became the Robe of Odysseus', *CQ* 50: 331–7.
- Whitehead, D. (1986), *The Demes of Attica 508/7—ca 250 BC* (Princeton, NJ).
- Whitmarsh, T. (2013), 'Radical Cognition: Metalepsis in Classical Greek Drama', *G&R* 60: 4–16.
- Wilamowitz = Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1955), *Der Glaube der Hellenen* i–ii (Berlin, 2nd edn).
- Wilhelm, G. (1994), 'Hymnen der Hethiter', in W. Burkert and F. Stolz (eds.), *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich* (Freiburg, Switzerland and Göttingen): 59–77.
- Wilkes, K. (1988), *Real People: Personal Identity without Thought Experiments* (Oxford).
- Willcock, M. M. (1973), 'The Funeral Games of Patroklos', *BICS* 20: 1–11.
- Willcock, M. M. (1975), 'Hysteron Proteron in the Homeric Style', *AJPh* 96: 107–9.
- Willcock, M. M. (1977), 'Ad hoc Invention in the *Iliad*', *HSCPh* 81: 41–53.
- Willcock, M. M. (1978–84), *The Iliad of Homer* i–ii (London).
- Willcock, M. M. (1983), 'Antilochos in the *Iliad*', in *Mélanges E. Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence and Marseilles): 477–85.
- Willcock, M. M. (1987), 'The Final Scenes of *Iliad* XVII', in Bremer, de Jong, and Kalff (eds.): 185–94.
- Willcock, M. M. (1990), 'The Search for the Poet Homer', *G&R* 37: 1–13.
- Willcock, M. M. (1995), *Pindar: Victory Odes* (Cambridge).
- Willcock, M. M. (1997), 'Neoanalysis', in Morris and Powell (eds.): 174–89.
- Willcock, M. W. (2001), 'Mythical Paradeigmata in the *Iliad*', in D. L. Cairns (ed.): 435–55; first published: *CQ* 14 (1964) 141–54.
- Williams, B. A. O. (1993), *Shame and Necessity* (Berkeley, CA and Oxford).
- Williams, F. (1978), *Callimachus Hymn to Apollo: A Commentary* (Oxford).
- Wilson, D. F. (2005), 'Demodokos' "*Iliad*" and Homer's', in R. J. Rabel (ed.), *Approaches to Homer: Ancient and Modern* (Swansea): 1–20.
- Wilson, J. R. (1986), 'The Gilgamesh Epic and the *Iliad*', *EMC* 30 (n.s. 5): 25–41.
- Wilson, N. G. (1994), *Photius, The Bibliotheca: A Selection Translated with Notes* (London).
- Wilson, N. G. (2007), *Aristophanea: Studies on the Text of Aristophanes* (Oxford).
- Woodard, R. D. (2007), 'Hesiod and Greek Myth', in R. D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology* (Cambridge): 83–165.
- Wright, G. M. and Jones, P. V. (eds.) (1997), *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation* (Oxford).
- Wright, M. E. (2005), *Euripides' Escape Tragedies* (Oxford).

- Wright, M. E. (2008), *Euripides Orestes* (London).
- Wright, M. E. (2012), *The Comedian as Critic: Greek Old Comedy and Poetics* (London).
- Young, D. C. (1967), 'Never Blotted a Line? Formula and Premeditation in Homer and Hesiod', *Arion* 6: 279–324.
- Young, D. C. (1968), *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7* (Leiden).
- Yunis, H. (2011), *Plato Phaedrus* (Cambridge).
- Zanetto, G. (1996), *Inni omerici* (Milan).
- Zarecki, J. P. (2007), 'Pandora and the Good Eris in Hesiod', *GRBS* 47: 5–29.

Index of Passages

(of Greek, Latin, and Akkadian texts)

GREEK

ACESANDER (*BNJ* 469)
F4 251 n. 34

AELIAN, *Nature of Animals*
12.21 206

AESCHYLUS
Agamemnon
40 243
184–227 139
975–1000 137 n. 163

Choephoroi
231–2 50 n. 71

Persians
8–11 137 n. 163

‘AESCHYLUS’
fr. *193 *TGrF* 201
PV 351–72 203 n. 297
PV 351–2 203 n. 300

ALCAEUS (ed. Voigt)
fr. 42.14 72 n. 203

ALCMAN (*PMG*)
fr. 3.1–3 76 n. 225
fr. 14(a).1–3 76 n. 225

ANTIPHANES (*PCG*)
fr. 189 145

ANTIPHON (*BNJ* 1096)
F1b 219 n. 382

[APOLLODORUS]
Library
1.6.3 203
3.206–7 232 n. 22

Epitome
3.1–7.40 241
3.2 154
3.4 229 n. 3
3.15 41 n. 17
3.17 244 n. 34
3.18–19 243 n. 27
3.20 244
4.6 242

4.6–8 241

4.7 242

4.8 242

5.3–5 241

5.3 248

5.5 242

5.6 242

5.12 244

20.1 57

APOLLONIUS RHODIUS

1.247–305 110 n. 28

1.496–8 182 n. 198

3.53–4 175 n. 169

3.210–41 42

3.460–1 110 n. 28

4.1028 67 n. 168

APPIAN, *Punica*

132 (628–30) 111

ARGONAUTICA ORPHICA

26–7 83 n. 25

1191–6 83 n. 25

1192 79 n. 6, 96 n. 87

ARISTOPHANES

Acharnians

9–11 76 n. 228

628–9 9 n. 46

Clouds

538–43 9 n. 46

Ecclesiazusae

580 140 n. 179

Frogs

1–2 9 n. 46

111 139

136 139

868 76 n. 228

Horsemen

507–9 9 n. 46

Lysistrata

538 227

1295 76 n. 225

Peace

734–5 9 n. 46

741–7 9 n. 46

ARISTOPHANES (*cont.*)*Thesmophoriazusae*

785 9 n. 46

910 50 n. 71

ARCHILOCHUS, *Telephus elegy*

fr. 1.22 251

ARISTOTLE

Poetics

1448b28–9 79 n. 3

1451b21–2 145 n. 215

1451b25–6 145 n. 215

1454b5–6 175 n. 167

Rhetoric

1417a15 230

Fragments (ed. Rose)

fr. 163 96 n. 91

[ARISTOTLE] (ed. Rose)

fr. 640 no. 11 249 n. 27

ASCLEPIADES (*FGrH* 12)

F4 83 n. 25

ATHENAEUS

1.22b 20 n. 118

12.535e 218 n. 380

14.632f 76 n. 226

BABRIUS

Prologue to Book 2, ll. 1–3 201 n. 284

BACCHYLIDES

3.97–8 19

5.136–54 129

5.155–8 129

5.172–5 129

9.9 76 n. 225

11.59–60 250 n. 30

13.121–40 27 n. 172, 261 n. 20

17.14–16 251

BEROSSUS (*BNJ* / *FGrH* 680)

F3b 207

F4 207 n. 323

F4a–b 207 n. 323

CALLIMACHUS

Epigrams

28.1 55 n. 105

Bath of Pallas

21–2 154 n. 40

Hymns

2.91 251 n. 34

Fragments (ed. Pfeiffer)

fr. 194 201

CALLISTHENES (*FGrH* 124)

F33 203 n. 300

CLEARCHUS (ed. Wehrli)

fr. 25 236 n. 13

CLEMENS ALEXANDRIUS

Protrepticus

2.17.1 79 n. 6

2.20.1 91 n. 60

Stromateis

1.16.79.3 232 n. 21

COLLUTHUS, *Rape of Helen*

94–8 154

155–61 154

CYCLUS EPICUS (ed. Bernabé)

Aethiopsis, fragments and testimonia

fr. 3 57

Testimonia 9 p. 66 144 n. 210

Aethiopsis, Summary

pp. 67–8 ll. 4–8 56

p. 68 ll. 10–11 60

p. 68 ll. 11–12 248

p. 68 l. 12 61

pp. 68–9 ll. 12–16 57, 127

pp. 68–9 ll. 14–15 63, 65, 180 n. 189

p. 69 l. 15 66

p. 69 ll. 16–23 57

p. 69 l. 16 144 n. 210

p. 69 ll. 19–21 120, 125

p. 69 ll. 20–1 86

p. 69 ll. 21–2 63

p. 69 ll. 22–4 241 n. 18, 242

Cypria, fragments

fr. 1 3, 125 n. 123, 205 n. 309

fr. 1.1–7 152 n. 27, 218 n. 377

fr. 1.6–7 2, 159

fr. 1.7 3 nn. 9–10

fr. 4–5 148–9

fr. 4 202

fr. 5–7 153–4

fr. 5 151

fr. 5.1 209 n. 328

fr. 19 74 n. 216

fr. 21 74 n. 216

fr. 28 125 n. 123

Cypria, Summary

p. 38 l. 4 3 n. 11

p. 39 ll. 18–19 229 n. 3, 233

p. 40 ll. 30–3 53, 141

p. 40 ll. 33–5 41

p. 40 l. 33 243, 244 n. 34

p. 40 l. 36 244 n. 34

p. 41 ll. 42–3 243

p. 41 ll. 43–6 140 n. 183

p. 41 l. 46 244 n. 34

p. 41 ll. 47–8 64, 180 n. 189

p. 42 ll. 55–6 142 n. 198

p. 42 ll. 61–3 141
 pp. 42–3 ll. 62–5 233
 p. 43 ll. 66–7 125 n. 123

Epigoni

fr. 1 26 n. 163

Iliou Persis, fragments

fr. 5 112 n. 41

Iliou Persis, Summary

p. 89 ll. 20–1 113 n. 47, 115 n. 61

Little Iliad, fragments

fr. 21 115 n. 61, 125

fr. 21.1–5 112, 150 n. 17

fr. 21.1 113 n. 48

fr. 21.3 114

fr. 21.3–4 88 n. 49, 160

fr. 21.4 113, 114, 115

fr. 24.1 244 n. 34

fr. 29.4 159

Little Iliad, Summary

p. 74 ll. 12–13 244

p. 74 l. 3 241 n. 18

p. 74 ll. 6–8 151 n. 20

pp. 74–5 ll. 15–16 51 n. 76,

139 n. 173

Nostoi, Summary

pp. 94–5 ll. 12–13 244 n. 34

Thebais, fragments and testimonia

fr. 9 180 n. 189

Testimonia 7–8 110 n. 28

DIO CHRYSOSTOM

11.71–2 243 n. 27

11.96–7 240 n. 8

11.102 240 n. 8

11.106 240 n. 8

11.110 240 n. 8

52 99

52.14 151 n. 20

DIODORUS SICULUS

1.12.10 200 n. 283, 219 n. 385

1.97.7 219 n. 385

4.23.2 165

5.3.4–6 94 n. 77

32.24 111

ETYMOLOGICUM MAGNUM

227.53–4 231 n. 17

685.57 231 n. 17

EMPEDOCLES (edd. Diels–Kranz)

fr. 17 182 n. 198

EUDEMUS (ed. Wehrli)

fr. 150 207 n. 323

EURIPIDES

Andromache

1255–6 180 n. 189

Electra

487–584 9 n. 46

539–40 50 n. 71

Hecuba

239–48 139

243 139 n. 174

Helen

23–41 2 n. 5

36–7 3 n. 11

1056 140

1301–68 83 n. 25

1315–16 94 n. 77

1315 236 n. 4

Hercules Furens

1353–6 129 n. 134

Iphigeneia at Aulis

337–60 139

1067–75 60

Ion

560 209 n. 332

1413–25 50 n. 71

Phoenissae

324–6 120 n. 88

751–2 9 n. 46

854–5 26 n. 162, 67 n. 170

Fragments (TGrF)

fr. 1082 3 n. 11

fr. 484 182 n. 198

EUSTATHIUS, *Commentarii ad Homeri*

Iliadem (ed. van der Valk)

9.556 = ii.808.25–8 75 n. 220

16.432 = iii.1069.23–9 67 n. 169

22.63–4 = iv.571.23–6 112 n. 43

23.553 = iv.782.21–783.1 136 n. 158

24.732–5 = iv.979.46–7 112 n. 41

HYMNI HOMERICI

Aphrodite

3–4 156

7 152 n. 29

16–20 198

33 152 n. 29

38–44 155

38 152 n. 29

54–5 157 n. 58, 162 n. 83

54 153, 157 n. 57

56–7 180, 181

58–64 88 n. 49, 148, 149 n. 5, 151

58–63 149 n. 5, 153, 186

58–9 202

HYMNI HOMERICI (cont.)

60 158 n. 62
 63 158 n. 62
 64 160
 66 202
 68 153, 158 n. 63
 76–80 157 n. 58, 162 n. 83
 76 162 n. 84
 79 162 n. 84
 81 155
 89–90 163 n. 86
 91 155
 91–154 155, 163 n. 87
 113–16 218 n. 380
 126–42 163 n. 88
 160 162 n. 83
 166–7 163 n. 89
 168–9 162 n. 83
 177–290 155
 190 185 n. 206
 196–7 157 n. 60, 158 n. 64, 163 n. 90, 166, 168
 196 157 n. 59
 197 160, 166 nn. 116–17, 168
 202–40 173, 178, 182, 184
 202–38 179 n. 187
 202–6 64 n. 157, 65 n. 158
 255 157 n. 59
 291 155

Apollo
 146–50 14 n. 80
 165–72 14 n. 80
 166–73 19–21
 174–5 47 n. 55
 540–3 20 n. 117

Demeter
 1 80 n. 10
 1–3 80, 85, 100
 3 99 n. 105
 5–21 94
 5 94
 6–8 79 n. 6
 8–12 237 n. 15
 9 3 n. 10, 99 n. 105
 17 96 n. 88
 30 99 n. 105
 33–9 91
 40 98
 51–90 86–7
 52–63 100
 54–6 82–3, 87, 96, 103, 238 n. 20
 54 88
 55 88 n. 55
 75 88 n. 53
 78–9 99 n. 105
 88–9 87 n. 46
 90–2 98

90 98
 93–7 91
 98–112 80 n. 7
 109 236 n. 9
 120 96 n. 92
 193 88
 237 65 n. 165
 242 180 n. 189
 248–9 237 n. 18
 256–62 237 n. 19
 260–1 180 n. 189
 268–83 91
 268 88
 302–13 91 n. 63
 302–6 98
 302–4 91
 305–9 91
 308–9 91 n. 63
 313 99 n. 105
 321 88 n. 53
 325–6 98
 334–74 95
 334–9 99 n. 105
 375–89 97
 375–85 98
 406–33 94
 406 96
 413 96 n. 92
 414 99 n. 105
 418–24 96 n. 87
 418–23 95–6, 103, 235 n. 2
 418 88 n. 55, 96 n. 87
 420–3 96 n. 87
 424 94–6
 425 96
 429–30 96 n. 88
 433 96
 436 98
 438–40 100
 441–7 99 n. 105
 449–50 98
 450–6 98
 457 98
 473–82 92
 484 97
 492 88 n. 50
 493 80 n. 10

Hermes
 1–9 14 n. 80, 21 n. 120, 85 n. 36
 251 202 n. 293
 514–15 150 n. 17

Other Homeric Hymns
 1 24 n. 144, 151
 6.1 209
 8.2 72 n. 204
 10 14 n. 80

10.3 209 n. 329
 13.1 80 n. 10
 13.2 80 n. 10
 18.1–9 14 n. 80, 21 n. 120, 85 n. 36

HERODIAN (ed. Lentz)
 1.546.20–1.547.3 98 n. 101

HERODOTUS
 1.30.1 219 n. 382
 1.88.1 43 n. 30
 2.116 23, 200 n. 283, 219 n. 385
 2.117 202, 229 n. 3, 233
 2.156.6 200 n. 283
 2.23 79 n. 3
 2.53 79 n. 3
 4.35.3 76 n. 226
 4.78.1 218 n. 380
 6.21.2 76 n. 227
 6.29.2 218 n. 380
 7.45 111
 8.99.2 111
 9.16.3 111

[HERODOTUS]
Vit. Hom. 6 219 n. 385

HERACLITUS (edd. Diels–Kranz)
 fr. 104 29 n. 184

HESIOD
Theogony
 1 47 n. 55
 22–4 19 n. 114
 36 47 n. 55
 100 73 n. 208
 116–210 218 n. 378
 121–2 156 n. 47
 176–206 209
 180 209 n. 332
 182 210
 188 209 n. 332
 194 209 n. 331
 197 209
 200 209 n. 332
 205 152 n. 29
 223–32 18 n. 103
 280 206 n. 319
 304 201, 203
 306 203 n. 297
 477–84 202
 485–7 168
 497–500 168
 499–500 168
 536 202
 573–89 149 n. 4
 886–929 85 n. 36

912–14 79–80, 85, 100
 913–14 156 n. 52
 938–9 156 n. 52
 984 72 n. 204
 987–91 64 n. 157
 989 209 n. 328
 991 180 n. 189
 1008–10 156 n. 52, 157 n. 54
 1008 157 n. 59
 1009 157 n. 56
 1010 153, 157 n. 57

Works and Days

11–26 18 n. 103
 72–89 149 n. 4
 256–62 199
 264–5 2 n. 5
 388 209 n. 332
 650–1 219
 656–9 219
 733 209 n. 332

‘HESIOD’ (edd. Merkelbach–West)
 fr. 2 204
 fr. 4 204
 fr. 23a.17–26 64 n. 157
 fr. 23a.24 180 n. 189
 fr. 23b 180 n. 189
 fr. 25.12–13 75 n. 220
 fr. 43a.61–4 141 n. 186
 fr. 137 204
 fr. 139 204
 fr. 176.1 209 n. 328
 fr. 204.98–100 2 n. 5
 fr. 204.118–19 2
 fr. 234 205 n. 308
 fr. 357.2 72 n. 207

[HESIOD], *Shield of Herakles*
 42–5 260 n. 9
 242–4 109 n. 21

HESYCHIUS
 τ 229 65 n. 160

HOMER
Iliad
 1.1–7 1, 152 n. 27
 1.2 44
 1.3–5 159
 1.3 2
 1.5 1, 3, 22–3
 1.12–348 94 n. 75
 1.37–43 45 n. 38
 1.59 124 n. 119
 1.108–9 124–5 n. 119
 1.240–4 57
 1.352 62

HOMER (*cont.*)

- 1.362-3 121 n. 91
 1.364-92 94 n. 75
 1.365 121 n. 91
 1.396-7 142
 1.407 142
 1.416-18 62
 1.496-530 63
 1.498 64
 1.500-10 199
 1.502 63
 1.505-6 62, 64
 1.541-2 64
 1.591 114
 2.295-6 243
 2.300-32 40, 96 n. 90
 2.301-3 142
 2.303-4 41
 2.323-9 41
 2.329-30 243
 2.330 41
 2.484-760 18 n. 105
 2.484 47 n. 55
 2.486 47 n. 55
 2.488-90 184 n. 202, 186, 187
 2.549-51 64 n. 157
 2.631-7 212
 2.690 233
 2.783 201, 203
 2.803-6 218 n. 380
 2.819-21 157 n. 54
 2.821 153, 157 n. 56, 157 n. 59
 2.822 157 n. 57
 3.33-7 261
 3.164-5 3 n. 11
 3.205 142
 3.243-4 64 n. 152
 3.276 87 n. 46
 3.380-2 64 n. 158
 3.382-447 175
 3.387 175
 3.389-447 177
 3.390 226 n. 20
 3.406-9 154
 3.441-442 182 n. 196
 3.441-7 182
 3.443 175, 188 n. 222
 3.446 182 n. 196
 4.8 202 n. 293
 4.148-82 256
 4.163-5 258
 4.437-8 218 n. 380
 4.439-45 177
 5.1-8 226
 5.18 210 n. 333
 5.23 64 n. 158
 5.114-32 176
 5.115-21 45 n. 38
 5.247-8 157 nn. 54, 59
 5.311-18 82
 5.313 157 n. 58, 162 n. 83, 175
 5.318-27 142
 5.331-3 176
 5.334-430 173 n. 156, 216
 5.337-430 195, 197, 199 n. 280, 226
 5.343 173
 5.344-6 142
 5.347-51 173
 5.348-51 176
 5.352 173
 5.354 173
 5.361 173
 5.370 173
 5.373-4 197
 5.381 173
 5.381-91 175 n. 170
 5.383-404 173
 5.385-404 178, 184, 185 n. 207
 5.385 188 n. 222
 5.392 188 n. 222
 5.396 188 n. 222
 5.418-19 175
 5.420-30 198
 5.422-5 175
 5.428-30 176
 5.430 176
 5.436 196 n. 266
 5.438 196 n. 266
 5.472-4 107 n. 9
 5.565-72 248 n. 9, 253
 5.699 72 n. 204
 5.793-859 176
 5.855-63 177
 5.855-8 140
 5.859-906 195, 226
 5.908 202 n. 293
 6.121-240 196 n. 266
 6.128-41 185 n. 207
 6.145 196 n. 266
 6.199 72 n. 204
 6.234 136-7 n. 163
 6.290-2 233
 6.319-502 256-7
 6.356-8 3 n. 11
 6.357-8 143 n. 203
 6.367-8 108 n. 18
 6.369-502 125
 6.372 113
 6.373 108, 113, 119
 6.386 113
 6.388 113
 6.389 109, 113

- 6.395–8 115 n. 61
6.398 72 n. 204
6.399–400 113
6.403 107 n. 9
6.405 108
6.407–9 108 n. 11
6.407 109 n. 25
6.447–9 258
6.454–65 112
6.466–70 116
6.467–8 113
6.467 114, 160
6.471 112
6.484 108
6.486 111–12
6.490–3 46, 70 n. 185, 225, 226 n. 17
6.490 226
6.492 224
6.493 226–7 n. 21
6.495 226
6.496 108
6.500–2 109, 119
6.500 127
6.506–11 260, 261 n. 23
7.85 65 n. 160
7.401 209 n. 332
8.47 153 n. 38
8.78–98 247, 253
8.81–8 248
8.91 251
8.92 251
8.103 251
8.113 252
8.186 251–2
8.192 252
8.362–3 141
8.470–7 3 n. 11
8.473–7 121
9.14–15 260 n. 8
9.168 74
9.182–98 18 n. 105, 74, 95 n. 83
9.189 73 n. 208
9.312 46 n. 50
9.336 122 n. 98
9.339–41 2 n. 5
9.340–3 122 n. 98
9.378–87 45
9.380 46
9.381 158 n. 67
9.410–16 46 n. 46, 62
9.421–9 74 n. 215
9.430–3 73–4 n. 212
9.433 74, 130
9.510–12 199
9.523 45
9.524–605 129
9.524–99 214
9.524–5 142
9.527–8 142
9.562 75 n. 220
9.611–19 74
9.617–22 74
9.693–6 73–4 n. 212
10.285–90 142
10.318–27 139 n. 177
11.55 2
11.75–7 202 n. 293
11.79 3 n. 11
11.182 153 n. 38
11.599–617 74
11.608–10 74
11.765–805 74
11.794–7 62
11.796–803 127 n. 126
12.15 243
12.299–308 261 n. 20
13.10–38 202
13.10–12 153 n. 38
13.459–61 154
13.521–5 128 n. 131
13.568 209 n. 332
13.720 72 n. 204
14.153–8 153 n. 38
14.157–8 181
14.157 153
14.160 152 n. 29
14.161–86 196 n. 262
14.166–72 148, 151
14.166 202 n. 293
14.169 158 n. 62
14.172 158 n. 62, 160
14.188–224 152, 154
14.198–99 156
14.199 151 n. 19
14.201 151 n. 19, 182 n. 198, 204
14.205 182 n. 198
14.206–7 182 n. 198
14.206 182 n. 198
14.214–17 154
14.234 141 n. 186
14.244–8 155
14.244–6 182 n. 198
14.246 182 n. 198
14.249–62 141 n. 186
14.283 153, 158 n. 63
14.294 155
14.297 155
14.298–314 155
14.302 204
14.304 182 n. 198
14.305 182 n. 198
14.313–25 155

HOMER (*cont.*)

- 14.314–315 182 n. 196
 14.315–28 174 n. 166, 196 n. 262
 14.315–27 173, 178, 182, 184, 189 n. 224
 14.317 188 n. 222
 14.319 188 n. 222
 14.321 188 n. 222
 14.323 188 n. 222
 14.326–7 188 n. 222
 14.328 182 n. 196
 14.333–36 150
 14.344 150
 15.13–77 155
 15.18–30 140–1
 15.36–8 196 n. 262
 15.61–77 3 n. 11
 15.78–85 155
 15.110–42 128 n. 131
 15.138–41 66
 15.151 158 n. 63
 15.187–93 151 n. 19, 212
 15.189–95 196 n. 262
 15.221 72 n. 204
 15.263–8 260 n. 8, 261 n. 23
 15.458 72 n. 204
 15.478–82 46 n. 50
 15.624–9 261 n. 20
 16.1–3 58 n. 121
 16.3 74, 130
 16.3–4 135 n. 155, 260 n. 8
 16.7–11 135 n. 155
 16.36–100 57
 16.36–9 62
 16.50–1 62
 16.72 74
 16.130–44 60
 16.317–24 248 n. 9, 253
 16.358 72 n. 204
 16.419–61 90
 16.431–61 64, 66, 69 n. 184
 16.433 26 n. 165, 66
 16.441 66
 16.444–7 63, 66–7
 16.446 26 n. 163, 67
 16.453–7 64
 16.456 65 n. 160
 16.457 64 n. 152, 65, 90
 16.458–9 68
 16.480–505 57
 16.521–2 66
 16.536 72 n. 204
 16.654 72 n. 204
 16.666–83 90
 16.667 65
 16.670 65
 16.671–5 64
 16.674 65 n. 160
 16.675 65
 16.678 64
 16.679 65
 16.680 65
 16.681–3 64, 123 n. 107
 16.712 144 n. 210
 16.775–6 72 n. 203
 16.776 72 n. 203
 16.788–857 57
 16.793–804 61 n. 139
 16.818–57 57
 16.823–8 123 n. 107
 16.845 145 n. 211
 16.853–4 144 n. 208
 17.45–60 138 n. 170
 17.125 60
 17.194–7 60
 17.289–90 71 n. 202
 17.377–80 127
 17.406–11 121 n. 91
 17.406–9 62
 17.410–11 121 n. 91
 17.426–40 121
 17.641–2 127–8
 17.648 126
 17.651–701 126–30
 17.652–3 127
 17.681–96 127
 17.681 127
 17.695–6 59, 126, 128, 130 n. 138
 17.715–61 57
 18.1–147 119–26
 18.1–2 58 n. 121
 18.3–14 127–8
 18.8–11 62
 18.9–11 121 n. 91
 18.17 58 n. 121, 74, 126, 130
 18.22–71 85
 18.26–7 72 n. 203, 86, 89
 18.26 72, 121, 158 n. 67
 18.32 126
 18.35–145 256
 18.35–71 57
 18.35–69 123 n. 108
 18.37 119
 18.39–49 18 n. 105, 158 n. 67
 18.51 119
 18.59–60 46, 70 n. 185
 18.65–6 119
 18.71 119
 18.72 119
 18.73–4 121 n. 91
 18.84–5 60
 18.94 119
 18.95–6 62, 120 n. 83

- 18.95 62
 18.96 61–3 121 n. 91, 240 n. 8
 18.117–19 66
 18.144 61
 18.151–64 57
 18.189–91 61
 18.191 61
 18.311 137 n. 163
 18.369–19.13 60
 18.369 202 n. 293
 18.440–1 46, 70 n. 185
 18.453 144 n. 210
 18.464–7 61
 19.12–13 60
 19.38–9 123
 19.97 152 n. 29
 19.270–4 3 n. 11
 19.282–300 122
 19.291–7 122
 19.297–9 122 n. 98
 19.301–2 107, 129
 19.302 122
 19.326–33 243 n. 31
 19.338–9 107 n. 7
 19.399–424 121
 19.407 144 n. 209
 19.408–24 120 n. 83
 19.416–17 144 n. 208
 19.418 144 n. 209
 20.61–5 200
 20.90 141 n. 189
 20.94–6 176
 20.137 224
 20.147 141 n. 188
 20.176–211 196 n. 266
 20.178–86 154
 20.188 26 n. 164, 141
 20.203–4 142
 20.203 196 n. 266
 20.208 157 nn. 54, 59
 20.234–5 65 n. 158
 20.264–6 61
 20.268 61
 20.291–340 64 n. 158
 20.300–8 154
 20.302–8 157 n. 60, 166
 20.307–8 158 n. 64, 167 n. 120, 168
 20.308 160, 166 n. 116
 20.443–54 123 n. 106
 20.443–4 64 n. 158
 20.445 196 n. 266
 20.447 196 n. 266
 21.49–59 73–4 n. 212
 21.74 45 n. 39
 21.109–10 66
 21.110–13 120 n. 83
 21.113 115
 21.277–8 121 n. 91, 144 n. 210
 21.391–434 196
 21.396–9 140, 196
 21.441–2 141
 21.479–514 195, 199 n. 280, 226
 21.481–8 177 n. 178, 198
 21.509–10 197
 21.510 197 n. 268
 21.594 61
 21.596–22.20 123 n. 106
 21.597 64 n. 158
 22.33–4 109 n. 21
 22.59 45
 22.63–4 112 n. 43
 22.71–6 158 n. 67
 22.77–8 109 n. 21
 22.82 45 n. 39
 22.90–144 136 n. 163
 22.93–7 261
 22.166–87 69 n. 184
 22.299 145 n. 211
 22.322–63 57
 22.322–7 61 n. 139
 22.323 61
 22.329 144 n. 209
 22.349–54 45
 22.359–60 57, 120 n. 83, 144
 22.360 57
 22.368 60
 22.395–405 139 n. 177
 22.406–7 130
 22.410–11 107, 109 n. 22
 22.422 44
 22.437–41 127
 22.437–9 114
 22.440–6 114
 22.448 130
 22.459 109 n. 25
 22.460 109
 22.468–72 130
 22.510–14 114
 23.9 65 n. 159
 23.14 120, 123 n. 108, 158 n. 67
 23.80 67 n. 170
 23.82–92 242
 23.110–897 57
 23.136 119 n. 79
 23.185–7 123
 23.192–230 123 n. 108
 23.192–218 123 n. 106
 23.283–4 121
 23.291–2 142
 23.306–7 250 n. 31
 23.396–7 126 n. 125
 23.411 251

HOMER (*cont.*)

- 23.555 136
 23.576 251
 23.578 251
 23.700–39 241
 24.23–30 154 n. 41
 24.29 154
 24.31–140 44
 24.83–6 120
 24.84–6 64
 24.93–4 64
 24.94 120
 24.98–102 64
 24.104–5 64
 24.112 64
 24.161–8 107 n. 8
 24.191–328 256
 24.257 124–5 n. 119
 24.281–508 42–3, 46
 24.309 45
 24.314 45 n. 38
 24.327–8 110 n. 28
 24.357 45
 24.467 243 n. 31
 24.503–4 45
 24.509–12 107
 24.601–20 172
 24.615–16 203 n. 297
 24.703 119 n. 82
 24.712 119 n. 79
 24.723 119 n. 82
 24.724 119 n. 79
 24.732–8 115
 24.735 112, 114–15, 150 n. 17, 158 n. 67,
 159–60
 24.747 119 n. 82
 24.761 119 n. 82
 24.765 243, 245
Odyssey
 1.4 44, 132 n. 146
 1.10 1 n. 2, 47, 97 n. 94
 1.22–87 44
 1.93 59 n. 129, 95 n. 83
 1.161–2 44
 1.235–43 44
 1.285 59 n. 129, 95 n. 83
 1.325–7 97 n. 94
 1.326–7 140
 1.328–64 256–7
 1.339 1 n. 2, 47 n. 55
 1.350–2 140
 1.351–2 73
 1.356–64 257
 1.356–9 46, 70 n. 185, 225
 1.356 226
 1.358–9 224
 1.358 257
 1.359 226–7 n. 21
 1.360–4 226 n. 17
 1.360 226
 1.362 226
 2.118–22 142
 2.163–76 40
 2.175–6 243
 2.246–51 128 n. 132
 2.372–3 128 n. 132
 3.55–62 45 n. 38
 3.110 71 n. 198
 3.111–12 124 n. 111, 248
 3.131 244 n. 34
 3.464–5 51 n. 74
 4.83–5 60 n. 130
 4.166 44 n. 31
 4.183–9 107
 4.186–8 124 n. 111
 4.187–8 56, 60 n. 130, 248
 4.228 205
 4.240–64 51, 75
 4.244–58 139
 4.250 139 n. 174
 4.252 51 n. 74
 4.333–50 17 n. 101
 4.669–73 128 n. 132
 4.679–758 256–7
 4.700–1 128 n. 132
 4.704–5 126 n. 125, 128, 130
 4.724–7 257
 4.724 128
 4.727 128
 4.729–31 128
 4.745–9 128 n. 132
 5.1–224 44
 5.119 185 n. 206
 5.121–8 184–5, 179 n. 187, 180
 5.121 188 n. 222
 5.125 188 n. 222
 5.136 66 n. 165
 5.203–20 46 n. 46
 5.209 66 n. 165, 180 n. 189
 5.372 49 n. 68
 5.394–7 259–61
 6.130–6 44, 261 n. 20
 6.224–45 189–90, 224 n. 7
 6.232–35 259
 6.255–7.154 42–7
 6.327 45
 6.328 45 n. 38
 6.329–31 42
 7.18–154 42
 7.234–97 49
 7.323 142
 8.31 142

- 8.32 142
 8.74–82 140
 8.78 136
 8.82 3 n. 10
 8.302 87 n. 46
 8.305 251
 8.324 202 n. 293
 8.362–6 147–51, 153
 8.362–3 202
 8.454–68 189–90, 224 n. 7
 8.499–520 214
 8.500 1 n. 2, 47 n. 55
 8.510–11 214 n. 358
 8.521–31 122 n. 102, 214 n. 361
 8.523–30 106 n. 6
 9.6 29 n. 184
 9.19–20 47, 97 n. 94, 140, 260 n. 14
 9.64–6 111
 9.263–7 44
 9.263–6 140
 9.366 211
 9.405–6 211
 9.407–8 211
 9.410 211
 9.414 211
 9.467 111
 10.201 111
 10.209 111
 10.241 111
 10.246–8 111
 10.321–47 189 n. 226
 10.398–9 111
 10.409 111
 10.454 111
 10.497–9 111
 10.576–8 111
 11.5 111
 11.181–3 128 n. 132
 11.195–6 128 n. 132
 11.225–332 53 n. 94
 11.297 3 n. 10
 11.345 225
 11.352–3 224
 11.353 225 n. 13, 226–7 n. 21
 11.368 225
 11.450–1 132
 11.468 59, 127 n. 126
 11.482–91 53 n. 94
 11.519–20 243 n. 31, 244
 11.521 203 n. 298
 11.522 56, 60 n. 130
 11.544–51 241 n. 18
 11.546 241 n. 18
 11.572–5 186 n. 211
 11.601–26 47 n. 53
 11.618–19 47
 11.618 67 n. 170
 12.70 26 n. 162, 47, 143–4
 12.234 111
 12.309–11 111
 13.339–43 42
 13.379 128 n. 132
 13.383–4 128 n. 132
 13.418 128 n. 132, 132 n. 146
 14.34 132 n. 148
 14.156 46 n. 50
 14.240–2 243
 15.156–8 132
 15.417–18 218 n. 380
 16.11–22 131–4
 16.13–15 132
 16.17–19 132
 16.19 132 n. 146
 16.31 132 n. 145
 16.139–45 128 n. 132
 16.155–77 132
 16.178 191
 16.189 132 n. 146
 16.190–1 132
 16.227–8 142
 16.424 143
 17.6–9 128 n. 132
 17.38–40 128 n. 132
 17.124–41 17 n. 101
 17.383–5 227 n. 23
 17.383 29 n. 184
 17.542 136
 18.35 136 n. 160
 18.100 136
 18.111 136 n. 160
 18.154 137 n. 163
 18.158–62 92 n. 67
 18.163 92, 136
 18.187–97 92 n. 67
 18.192–4 149 n. 4, 152
 18.281–3 132 n. 147
 19.53–604 256–7
 19.96–604 48–55
 19.175–7 218
 19.253–4 45 n. 37
 19.257–8 46, 70 n. 185
 19.266 44 n. 31
 19.357 72 n. 205
 19.467–79 130–1, 133
 19.469–70 130, 132
 19.470–1 130
 19.471–2 126 n. 125, 130 n. 138
 19.476–9 51, 130
 19.479 92 n. 67, 133, 137 n. 163
 19.485–6 128 n. 132
 19.491 72 n. 205
 19.571–81 52

HOMER (*cont.*)

19.602-4 52
 20.19-20 211
 20.88-94 52 n. 85
 20.93 37 n. 163
 20.134 72 n. 205
 20.333 136-7 n. 163
 20.345-9 136
 20.346 136-7 n. 163
 20.349 136-7 n. 163
 20.350-7 136-7 n. 163
 20.358 136-7 n. 163
 20.374 136-7 n. 163
 20.390 136-7 n. 163
 21.1-4 92 n. 67
 21.55-358 256-7
 21.56-7 52
 21.350-58 257
 21.350-3 70 n. 185, 225
 21.350 226
 21.352-3 224
 21.352 257
 21.353 226-7 n. 21
 21.354-8 226 n. 17
 21.354 226
 21.356-8 257 n. 19
 21.356 226
 21.381 72 n. 205
 21.406-8 261 n. 20
 21.406 225
 22.59 45
 22.61-4 45
 22.62 46
 22.120-5 46 n. 50
 22.312 45 n. 39
 22.344-9 97 n. 94
 22.345-9 143 n. 203
 23.75-7 128 n. 132
 23.111-16 260 n. 14
 23.115-16 190, 224 n. 7
 23.153-240 190, 224 n. 7
 23.153-72 260 n. 14
 23.159-62 259-260
 23.177-230 260 n. 14
 23.205-8 130
 23.207-8 128 n. 132
 23.233-8 259-61
 23.292 226 n. 21
 23.310-41 52
 24.16 59
 24.35-97 123
 24.36-7 53 n. 94
 24.39-64 86
 24.40 72, 86, 121
 24.47-64 120, 125
 24.47-62 57, 123 n. 108

24.58-73 252
 24.76-9 23 n. 138, 59, 67 n. 168, 242, 244
 24.77-9 59 n. 125
 24.78 60 n. 130
 24.79 71 n. 198
 24.85-92 57, 241 n. 18, 242
 24.93-4 53 n. 94
 24.115 53, 141
 24.121-90 93
 24.124-85 52
 24.127 52
 24.149 52
 24.167-9 53
 24.190 65 n. 159
 24.191-202 97 n. 94
 24.192-3 53 n. 94
 24.196-202 53 n. 94
 24.196-8 143 n. 203, 260 n. 14
 24.196 53 n. 94
 24.296 65 n. 159
 24.365-74 190-1, 224 n. 7
 24.370 191
 24.537 251

INSCRIPTIONS

Inscriptiones Graecae

II².2318 76 n. 228
 II².2319-2323 II².2319-2323
 VII.1785 21 n. 121
 VII.1790 21 n. 121

Marmor Parium (FGrH 239)

A13 98 n. 99
 A14 79 n. 2, 83 nn. 25-6, 92 n. 64

ISOCRATES

4.28 86 n. 43, 87 n. 45, 92 n. 64
 11.28 219 n. 382

LONGUS, *Daphnis and Chloe*

1.2 50 n. 71
 4.21 50 n. 71

LYCOPHRON, *Alexandra*

1226-80 167 n. 120

[MOSCHUS], *Epitaphius Bionis*

115-19 26-7 n. 166

NONNUS, *Dionysiaca*

1.408-9 204
 10.338 236 n. 13

ORPHICA

Orphicorum fragmenta (ed. Bernabé)

8F 209 n. 332
 22F 182 n. 198

Orphic Hymns

41.5-7 91 n. 62

PALAEPHATUS (*FGrH* / *BNJ* 44)

F1 83 n. 25

PANYASIS (ed. Bernabé)

fr. 27 204, 207 n. 321

PAPYRI

P. Barc. inv. no. 158–161

ll. 64–5 91 n. 62

P. Berol. 13044

ll. 3–5 79 n. 2

ll. 21–7 96, 103

ll. 33–5 79 n. 6

ll. 40–1 94

ll. 48–9 91 n. 60

l. 48 91 n. 59

ll. 52–6 80 n. 7

ll. 60–8 79 n. 6

l. 69 96

ll. 101–91 91 n. 61

ll. 102–19 86, 87

ll. 102–5 82, 83, 88, 96, 103

l. 103 88 n. 55

l. 120 81 n. 14, 91 n. 62

P. Derv.

xiii.3 82 n. 21

xiii.4 209 n. 332

xvi.9 82 n. 21

xxi.1 82 n. 21

xxii.7 79 n. 2

xxii.12 83 n. 25

xxvi.2 82 n. 21

xxvi.5 82 n. 21

xxvi.5–7 82 n. 21

PGM

iv.338 206 n. 320

lxx 206 n. 320

v.340 206 n. 320

P. Oxy.

663.i.14–19 154

PAUSANIAS

1.14.3 86, 87 n. 45, 92 n. 64

1.22.6 233

1.22.7 79 nn. 2, 5

1.38.3 79 n. 2

1.38.6 98 n. 99

1.39.1 79 n. 2, 80 n. 7

2.5.1 176 n. 174

3.15.10 176 n. 174

3.17.5 176 n. 174

4.1.5 79 nn. 2, 5

7.21.9 79 n. 3

8.31.2 94 n. 77

8.37.9 79 n. 2

8.42.2 91 n. 63

9.27.2 79 n. 3

9.29.8 79 n. 3

9.30.12 79 n. 5, 83 n. 25

9.31.9 79 nn. 2, 6

10.25.9 112 n. 41

PHERECYDES

FGrH 3 F54 203 n. 297fr. 58 *EGM* 251 n. 34PHILO JUDAEUS, *de praemiis et poenis*

23 204–5 n. 308

PHILO BYBLIUS (*FGrH* 790)

F2 167 n. 123

F2 §§15–41 207 n. 323

PHILOSTRATUS, *Heroicus*

25.2 79 n. 3

26.12 106 n. 6

26.18 248

47.3 242

PHOTIUS, *Library* (ed. Bekker)

103a 230

104a 230

112a 230

142a–b 230 n. 10

318b22 230

319a30 229

322a39 231

466b 230

477b 230–1

See also PROCLUS, *Chrestomathy* (ed. Severyns), for Photius *Bibl. cod.* 239.

PINDAR

Olympians

1.43–5 67 n. 168

1.52 250 n. 30

2.79–80 63

2.80 64

3.4–6 76 n. 225

4.6–7 203 n. 297

6.12–14 251 n. 39

6.17 252

6.51 166 n. 117

9.43 205 n. 308

9.48–9 76

Pythians

1.15–28 203 n. 297

1.16–17 252 n. 43

1.16 203 n. 300

2.18 252 n. 42

3.113 227 n. 23

4.277 247 n. 5

6.28–42 247, 249 n. 27, 251, 252

6.29 251

PINDAR (*cont.*)

- 6.31 252
 6.32–3 248
 6.32 248, 249 n. 23, 252
 6.36 251
 6.38 252
 6.39 251
 6.44–5 250
 6.51–2 250 n. 31
 8.16 203 n. 300
 8.38 251 n. 39
 9.43–51 121 n. 91

Nemean

- 6.41 252 n. 42
 7.21 247 n. 5
 8.20–1 76 n. 225
 10.60 250 n. 30
 10.61–2 250 n. 30

Isthmians

- 1.15 250 n. 31
 2.22 250 n. 31
 2.35–42 250 n. 32
 4.41 247 n. 5
 4.53 252 n. 42
 5.62–3 76 n. 225
 6.29 252 n. 42
 6.37 250 n. 30
 8.26a–55 125 n. 121
 8.56a–60 247, 252
 8.56a–58 125
 8.57–8 120, 125

Fragments (ed. Maehler)

- fr. 131b.3–5 137 n. 163
 fr. 265 55 n. 104

PLATO

Ion

- 530b10–11 14 n. 78
 537a4 14 n. 78

Laws

- 802a 76 n. 226
 810e12 14 n. 78
 829d8–e1 83 n. 25

Phaedrus

- 252b4–5 20 n. 116

Republic

- 424c1 73 n. 208
 475d 76 n. 227
 596b6–9 227

Symposium

- 187d1–2 76 n. 226
 209a4–5 227 n. 23

Timaeus

- 21b3–7 76 n. 229

PLUTARCH

- de malign. Her.* 857a 200 n. 283
quomodo adulescens 30d 229 n. 4

POLYBIUS

- 38.21 111
 4.20.8–10 76 n. 226

POSIDONIUS (edd. Edelstein–Kidd)

- F280.20–2 203 n. 298
 F281a.26–7 203 n. 298

PROCLUS, *Chrestomathy* (ed. Severyns)

ex Photii Bibliotheca cod. 239 (Severyns vol. ii)

- §§ 15–18 232 n. 26
 § 15 232 n. 27
 §§ 22–3 232 n. 27

ex Iliadis codicibus Procli fragmenta

(Severyns vol. iii)

- ll. 2–3 232 n. 27

- ll. 80–1 232 n. 27

See also CYCLUS EPICUS (ed. Bernabé), for
 the Proclan Summaries of the Cyclical
 epics.

PSEUDO-APOLLODORUS *See*

[APOLLODORUS]

QUINTUS SMYRNAEUS

- 1.9 138 n. 170
 1.469 227 n. 22
 1.657–61 124
 2.243–5 248
 2.302–3 250
 2.388–401 58
 2.447–8 58, 123 n. 107
 2.455 61 n. 136
 2.550–4 123 n. 107
 2.553–5 64 n. 154
 2.585–92 64 n. 156
 2.650–1 64 n. 154
 3.10 58
 3.26–82 123 n. 106
 3.48–50 123 n. 106
 3.357–9 123
 3.419 72 n. 203
 3.533–5 123
 3.551–76 122, 122
 3.582–604 123 n. 108
 3.698–718 123 n. 106
 3.699–716 123 n. 108
 3.743–65 122
 4.1–12 64 n. 156
 4.110–17 123 n. 108
 4.115 120 n. 88
 4.144–70 142 n. 192
 7.49–50 248

7.253–91 110 n. 28
 7.315–45 110 n. 28
 7.384–93 110 n. 28
 8.474–80 41 n. 19
 8.480 142 n. 192
 9.113–14 110 n. 28
 10.407–10 107 n. 7
 13.251–90 112 n. 41
 13.336–41 167 n. 120

SAPPHO (ed. Voigt)

fr. 1.2 152 n. 29
 fr. 1.14 209 n. 329
 fr. 140 165
 fr. 168 165

SCHOLIA

in Aristophanem

*Acharn.*10c 76 n. 228

in Euripidem

Andr. 10 112 n. 41

in Hesiodum

Th. 194 209 n. 332

in Homeri Iliadem

A 1.59 124 n. 115
 A 1.108–9b 124 n. 115
 A 6.457a 124 n. 115
 A 9.168 74 n. 215
 A 9.169 74 n. 215
 A 9.182 74 n. 215
 A 9.197 74 n. 215
 A 9.502 74 n. 215
 A 14.317 181 n. 193
 A 24.257b 124 n. 115
 A 24.735a 112 n. 44, 124 n. 115
 AT 16.854a 144 n. 209
 b 16.854a 144 n. 209
 bT 1.349 106 n. 4
 bT 5.385b 175 n. 170
 bT 6.471 116
 bT 9.168b 74 n. 218
 bT 16.844–5 *ex* 145 n. 211
 bT 17.401–2 128 n. 131
 bT 17.695a1 127 n. 126
 bT 17.695b 127 n. 129
 bT 18.71b 119 n. 80
 bT 19.282–302 106 n. 4
 bT 24.85a 120 n. 87
 D 1.5 23, 69 n. 179, 205 n. 309, 218 n. 378, 244
 D 1.59 244
 D 19.326 233
 T 9.668 233, 243 n. 27
 T 16.57 233
 T 16.851–4 144 n. 209
 T 22.62–4 124 n. 115

in Homeri Odysseam

4.245c 51 n. 75

in Pindarum

O.2.148 248 n. 14
 O.3.50b 248 n. 14
 O.6.160c 91 n. 62, 97 n. 96
 O.6.26 248 n. 14
 O.9.62b 204–5 n. 308
 O.9.64c 204–5 n. 308
 O.9.70b 248 n. 14
 N.2.1c 20 nn. 116, 118
 N.3.40 248 n. 14
 N.6.85b 248 n. 14
 N.10.114a 248 n. 14
 I.2 *inscr.* A 250 n. 32
 I.4.58b 248 n. 14

in Theocritum

15.100–1 165 n. 110

SIMONIDES (PMG)

fr. 513 250 n. 32
 fr. 564.4 29 n. 184

SOPHOCLES

Ajax

1273–87 139

Antigone

35–6 209 n. 332
 479 209 n. 332

Electra

566 140 n. 183
 1123 209 n. 332

Oedipus at Colonus

765–7 139

Oedipus Tyrannus

1515–22 139

Philoctetes

591–7 151 n. 20
 603–21 151 n. 20

Trachiniae

1 140
 500 152 n. 29
 1070–2 129 n. 134

Fragments (TGrF)

fr. 361 154 n. 40
 fr. 373.1–3 157 n. 55
 fr. 596 87 n. 46

STESICHORUS (PMGF)

fr. 193 26 n. 163

STRABO

1.1.2 219 n. 385
 14.1.16 219 n. 382
 13.1.52 166 n. 117

SUDA

ε 3585 79 nn. 2, 3
 π 2473 55 n. 103

THEOCRITUS
1.105–13 187, 188
1.112 26 n. 163
5.116 141 n. 191
24.6 119

THEOGNIS
22–3 20 n. 115

THUCYDIDES
1.138.1 218 n. 380
3.104.3–6 14 n. 80
3.104.5 20 n. 118

TIMOTHEUS (*PMG*)
791.202–36 76 n. 225
791.211–12 76 n. 226
791.216–17 76 n. 226
796 76 n. 226

TYRTAEUS (*IEG*)
10.25 209 n. 332

XENOPHON
Cynegeticus
1.14 249 nn. 15, 27

Hellenica
2.2.3 106 n. 6

Memorabilia
4.2.10 14 n. 78, 21 n. 120

Symposium
3.5 14 n. 78
3.5–6 21 n. 120

LATIN

CATULLUS
64.133 138
64.143 138
65.19–24 133 n. 152
68.144 170 n. 141

CICERO, *Philippics*
2.55 133 n. 151

CLAUDIAN, *Rape of Proserpine*
2.204–46 94 n. 77
2.206 236 n. 4
2.232–3 236 n. 4

ENNIUS, *Annals* (ed. Skutsch)
54 138
469–70 184 n. 202

GELLIUS, *Attic Nights*
17.10 249 n. 22

HORACE
Ars Poetica
133–5 174 n. 164

136–52 1 n. 3
Odes
2.13.21–40 26–7 n. 166
3.27.29–30 236 n. 13
4.6.11 72 n. 203

Epistles
2.1.18–92 200 n. 283

Satires
1.3.107–8 133 n. 151

HOSTIUS (ed. Courtney)
fr. 3 184 n. 202

HYGINUS, *Fabulae*
94 157 n. 55
251 91 n. 62
260 165 n. 110

LIVY
1.13.3 133 n. 151

NEPOS, *Themistocles*
10.1 218 n. 380

OVID
Ars Amatoria
2.169 138 n. 170
3.1 249 n. 20

Amores
1.7 138 n. 170

Fasti
3.471–5 138

Metamorphoses
8.621 201
12.1–13.622 41 n. 17
12.11–23 41 n. 17
14.812–15 138
15.160 138 n. 170

Tristia
1.5.53–8 184 n. 202, 187

PROPERTIUS
2.9.9–16 122, 124
2.13.45–50 124 n. 111
3.11.15–16 124

SENECA, *Medea*
1022–5 87 n. 46

SERVIUS
Commentarii in Vergilii Aeneidem
2.649 157 n. 55
6.625 184 n. 202
10.740 144 n. 209
Commentarii in Vergilii Georgica
2.42 184 n. 202

VIRGIL

Aeneid

- 1.23 138 n. 170
 1.259–60 68
 1.286–9 68
 1.314–493 42
 1.456–93 249
 1.456–7 68 n. 176
 1.489–93 249
 1.489 249
 1.586–613 42
 1.740–7 27 n. 171
 2.272 139 n. 177
 3.97–8 167 n. 120
 3.570–82 249 n. 22
 5.144–7 261 n. 20
 6.93 133 n. 151
 6.625–7 184 n. 202
 8.301 68
 8.382–4 26 n. 162, 68–9
 8.384 249
 8.583 110 n. 31
 8.584 110
 8.592 110 n. 31
 9.716 203 n. 296
 10.464–73 67–9
 10.469–71 26 n. 162, 67
 10.769–832 248, 250
 10.794–5 248
 10.794 249 n. 23
 10.812 249
 10.822 249
 10.824 249
 10.826 249
 11.23 65
 11.146–7 110 n. 31
 11.148–81 110
 11.480 133 n. 151
 11.648 26 n. 162, 249
 11.662 26 n. 162, 249
 12.54–80 133
 12.66 133 n. 152
 12.349 139 n. 177
 12.600 133 n. 151
 12.794–5 68

Georgics

- 1.39 91 n. 62
 1.104–10 261 n. 20
 1.373–82 180 n. 190
 2.43–4 184 n. 202
 4.563 19 n. 114

[VIRGIL], *Ciris*

- 512 170 n. 141

AKKADIAN

Atrahasis OBV

- I.1.11–16 196 n. 262, 212
 I.352–60 3 n. 11, 152 n. 27
 III.iii.36–9 3 n. 11

Enuma elish

- I.1–78 218 n. 378
 I.29–54 205 n. 309, 218 n. 378

Erbamma *rē'û*

- 6–7 170 n. 139

Etana SBV

- II.59–60 194 n. 249

Fable of Fox

- I.i.78–9 194 n. 249

Gilg. MB

- Boğ₂ rev. col. vi(?) 169 n. 132
 Boğ₂ rev. col. vi(?).5' 170 n. 142
 Emar₂ 169 n. 132, 179 n. 186
 Emar₂ i.22'–23' 171 n. 147

Gilg. SBV

- I.180–94 190
 III.35 110
 III.37–41 189 n. 225
 VI.1–114 169
 VI.1–21 179 n. 186
 VI.1–5 169–70
 VI.5–6 170 n. 137
 VI.6–21 194
 VI.6 180, 181
 VI.9 170, 191 n. 236
 VI.10–12 171
 VI.13 170
 VI.14–15 170
 VI.17–21 171
 VI.22–91 173, 215–16, 226
 VI.24–43 172 n. 151
 VI.44–79 171
 VI.44–78 172 n. 151
 VI.45–79 173, 182, 186, 187
 VI.46–7 171
 VI.46 165
 VI.58–63 186
 VI.64–78 171
 VI.79 172 n. 151
 VI.81–3 173
 VI.82–3 173, 194
 VI.96–100 195
 VI.100 191 n. 236
 VI.154–7 173
 VII.91–2 194 n. 249
 VII.184–92 191 n. 236
 VIII.149–50 162 n. 83

AKKADIAN (*cont.*)
 X.250 143
 XI.262–70 189 n. 225

Ishtar's Descent
 4–11 191 n. 236
 16–20 200 n. 281
 19–20 191 n. 236
 76–80 91 n. 63
 86–90 91 n. 63

Nerg.-Eresh. MBV
 77–87 189 n. 226

83 191 n. 236
Nerg.-Eresh. SBV
 I.13 191 n. 237
 I.35 191 n. 237
 I.39 191 n. 237
 II.24 191 n. 237
 III.(58')–(60') 189
 III.1'–5' 191 n. 236
 IV.(29') 191
 IV.(4')–(13') 189
 V.(9')–(12') = (25')–(28') 195
 V.11'–12' 191 n. 236

General Index

abridgement *see* epitome

Achilleus

and Aineias 141–2

and Diomedes *see* Diomedes

and Gilgamesh 176 n. 172, 197, 205–6, 216–17

and Odysseus 44, 46, 53 n. 94, 136, 186 n. 212

and Patroklos *see* Patroklos

and Telephos *see* Telephos

and Thetis *see* Thetis

armour of 27 n. 167, 49 n. 68, 60–1, 152, 241–2

‘best friend’ of 59, 242

burial of 59

death of 119–23, 144

funeral games of 120 n. 88, 123 n. 108, 242

funeral of 57, 63, 85–6, 120, 125, 217, 247, 252, 255

horsemanship of 72 n. 203

immortalization of 63–4

in *Cypria* 233

in **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) and *Iliad* 57–64, 72, 85–6, 127, 239–40, 241

life choice of 62, 70 n. 185; *see also* heroic choice

quarrels with Agamemnon 94 n. 75, 136

rejects embassy 45, 73–5

smiles 136

supplanted by Priamos 42–5, 47

wrath of 1–2

active heroism 44

actorial motivation *see* motivation, actorial

ad hoc invention *see* invention, ad hoc

Adonis 165, 175 n. 170, 186 n. 211, 187–8, 204, 207

Aelian, on ‘Gilgamesh’ 206

Aeneas 61 n. 136, 68, 133, 248–9; *see also* Aineias

Aeschylus

and performance of ‘old’ tragedies 76

Egyptian sources of (according to Herodotus) 200 n. 283

Pyschostasia 64 n. 155

see also tragedy; Index of Passages

Aethiopis

and *Iliad* 16 n. 95, 56–72, 75, 85–6, 89–90, 100, 120–1, 125–7, 239–43, 248, 252–3

and **Memnonis* 56

and neoanalysis 23

and Pindar *see* Pindar, and *Aethiopis*

as source for Propertius and Quintus

(?) 123–4

funeral of Achilleus in *see* Achilleus,

funeral of

transmission and reception of 55–6

see also Index of Passages

Agamemnon 2, 45–6, 74, 136, 139

age, of epic hero(in)es 243

agriculture, in *HDem* 79, 83 n. 26, 87, 91 n. 63, 92, 98

Aias 57, 61, 70, 73, 126–7, 139, 242

Aigypptos 204

Aineiadaï 163 n. 90, 165–6, 202 n. 294

Aineias 141–2, 157–8, 165–8, 174–5, 196;

see also Aeneas

Akkadian poetry: *see* Anzu; *Atrahasis*; *Enuma elish*; *Erra*; *Fable of the Fox*; *Gilgamesh*; *Ishtar’s Descent*; *Nergal and Ereshkigal*; *Worm and Toothache*

Alalu 167

‘Alexandrian footnote’ 188

Alexandrian poetry 24–6, 139 n. 171, 145, 187–8, 215, 251 n. 34

Alija, Vlahinjić (*Wedding of Vlahinjić Alija*)

5, 110, 111 n. 36, 214; *see also* Bosnian

heroic song

Allen, G. 223

Allen, Woody 117

allusion

unidirectional 11, 16–17, 40, 223–4;

see also bidirectional influence; direction of influence

use of term 34–5

versus intertextuality 34

via typical elements 11, 33, 41, 43, 45, 171, 255, 261

alphabet, introduction of to Greece 22

alternative versions *see* notional alternative versions; reifying alternative version

Amata 133–4

Ama-ushumgal-ana *see* Dumuzi

ambrosia 65–6, 71, 90, 123, 148–9, 237

Amphimedon 52–4, 93, 131, 141

Anacreon 84

analepsis 41, 71, 96, 122

analysis, Homeric 22, 27, 51, 53, 95, 103

Anat 177, 194, 198, 199

- Anchises
 affair with Aphrodite 151–8, 174–5,
 179–81, 187–8
 and Dumuzi 207, 154, 162–3
 as shepherd 153, 157, 162, 165
 punishment of 157
- Andromache
 and Hektor 46, 107–14, 124, 224–7, 255–8
 headdress of 130
 weeps 108–15, 118, 120 n. 90, 256
- Antenor 142
- Antilochos
 and Patroklos *see* Patroklos
 death of 247–53
 in funeral games of Patroklos 136
 weeps 58, 126–9, 130, 134
see also Achilles, ‘best friend’ of; vengeance
 theme
- Antinoos 142–3
- Antiphanes (comic poet) 145
- Antu *see* Anu and Antu
- Anu 167, 169, 177, 195, 207 n. 323
 and Antu 167, 173, 197, 205
 and Zeus *see* Zeus, and Anu
- Anzu 67 n. 168, 192
- Aphrodite
 affair with Anchises *see* Anchises, affair
 with Aphrodite
 and Adonis 165, 175 n. 170, 187–8
 and Ares 150, 176, 177
 and Artemis 197–8
 and Astarte 165, 198
 and Cyprus 202
 and deception 152, 209
 and Eryx 165
 and Hera *see* Hera, antagonistic
 relationship with Aphrodite
 and Kinyras 167
 and Paphos 149, 153, 167, 202 n. 293
 and war 176–7
 as *αἰδοίη* 209
 as Paris’ ‘lover’ 154
 as *φιλομμειδής* 209
 birth of 208–9
 conceives Aineias 157
 girdle of *see* girdle, of Aphrodite
 hexameter hymns to 156–7
 in seduction narratives 151–2
 parentage of 168 n. 130
 performs plaint in heaven 167, 173, 194,
 195–7, 215–16
 taunted by Athene 175
 vituperated by Daphnis 187–8, 198 n. 274
 wounded by Diomedes *see* Diomedes,
 wounds Aphrodite
see also Inanna; Ishtar; Shauska
- Apollo
 and Hermes *see* Hermes, and Apollo
 as Achilles’ killer 57, 75 n. 220, 144, 239
 removes and bathes Sarpedon’s body
 64–5, 90
 saves Aineias 142
- Apollonius of Rhodes 2, 23, 25 n. 154, 26, 42,
 216 n. 368
- Apologue*, of Odysseus 47, 111, 189
- Apsu 182, 204, 207 n. 323, 218 n. 378
- Aqhat 177, 194
- Arabos 204
- Aramaean 201, 203; *see also* Arimoi
- Aramaic 164, 198 n. 276, 203 n. 299, 204
- Archilochus 251
- Ares
 and Alodai 175 n. 170, 202 n. 294
 and Aphrodite 176; *see also* Demodokos,
 song of Ares and Aphrodite
 and Askalaphos 128 n. 131
 as *χαλκοκορυστά* 72 n. 204
 plaint in heaven by 195–8
 wounded by Diomedes 140, 177
- Arete 43–4, 49–50, 54, 72, 225; *see also*
 Penelope, and Arete
- Argo 47, 143
- Arimoi 201, 203
- Aristarchus 1 n. 1, 23, 32, 56 n. 106, 74 n.
 215, 124
- aristeia* 148, 176, 196, 239
- Aristophanes 26 n. 166, 139–40, 227; *see also*
 Comedy, Old
- arming, type-scene of 148, 149, 162,
 202, 256
- armour 108, 113
 divinely made 60–1, 65, 71, 72
see also Achilles, armour of
- arte allusiva* 4, 25
- Artemis
 and Anat 177 n. 178, 198 n. 274
 and immortalization of Iphigeneia 180 n. 189
 at rape of Persephone 94, 99, 236
 mistress of wild animals 198
 plaint in heaven by 195–8
 proof against Aphrodite 155
- artists 43 n. 30, 55, 108, 124, 141 n. 189, 221
- Ashurbanipal 176
- assimilation 48, 95, 196, 201, 205–6, 208,
 209–12
- Astarte 165, 198
- Astyanax 112–15, 118, 120, 124, 150, 159
- Athenaeus, knowledge of Epic Cycle 56 n. 106
- Athene
 administers ambrosia to hero 65 n. 165, 123
 and Anat 198 n. 274
 and Aphrodite 155, 175–6, 192, 197

- and Ares 176, 196–7
 as figure for the poet (*Odyssey*) 26, 51–2, 66, 92–3, 117, 132, 152
 at rape of Persephone 94, 99, 236
 beautifies Odysseus 259
 beautifies Penelope 152
 immortalizes Diomedes 180 n. 189
 prevents Penelope from recognizing Odysseus 51–2, 130, 132–3
 shepherds Odysseus in Scherie 42–4, 47
 taunts Aphrodite 175
 turns away suitors' νόημα 136–7 n. 163
 wounding of Ares 140
see also Judgement of Paris
Atrahasis 2, 3 n. 11, 143, 152 n. 27, 196 n. 262, 207 n. 323, 212, 218
 Attic drama 9–10, 26 n. 166, 29–30, 104, 116;
see also Comedy, Old; tragedy
 audience
 and detection of innovation 27–8, 49, 54, 86, 90, 212–13; *see also* 'rhetoric of traditionality'
 and metalepsis 116–18
 liking for new songs 73
 surprised 73–4 n. 212, 98
 variegated composition of 29, 126, 219
see also ideal listener
 audience knowledge 3, 5, 10, 14, 28, 29–31, 45, 75, 92, 101–2, 104, 121, 128, 137, 143, 200–1, 212 n. 346, 219–20, 228; *see also* fallacy of audience limitation; irony, dramatic; poetic memory
 audience limitation, fallacy of *see* fallacy of audience limitation
 Aulis 41, 96 n. 90, 139, 142, 243–4
 authorship, in early Greek hexameter poetry 18–21
 Baal 91, 204, 207
 Bacchylides 19, 27 n. 172, 129, 134, 247, 261 n. 20
 Bakhtin, M. 223
 Barlow, M. and Kemmer, S. 227
 'bath' type-scene 189 n. 225
 bath, beautifying 224
 bathing and dressing 169–70, 189–91, 193;
see also toilette, goddess's
Battle of Finnesburh 213–14
 Baubo 87–8, 236–8
 Belos 204, 205–7; *see also* Baal
Beowulf 6, 113 n. 45, 213–16
 Bernabé, A. 81, 103, 204
 Berossus 207
 bidirectional influence 17, 34, 159
 Bilgames: *see* *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*;
Bilgames, Death of
Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven 169–70, 172, 173 nn. 157–8, 177, 191 n. 236, 193, 195, 199–200, 216
Bilgames, Death of 217
 bilingual poets 218–22
 bilingualism 164, 218
 block formula *see* formula, block
 Böhme, R. 100
 borrowing, as metapoetic metaphor 27, 152
 Bosnian heroic song 5, 6 n. 28, 13, 28 n. 177, 29 n. 185, 111, 214–15
 Boutes 165
 Briseis 2, 106–7, 122–9, 233
 Branković, Vuk 145
 Burgess, J. S. 32, 58, 70, 102, 118, 140
 Burkert, W. 19, 103, 150, 173, 177, 183–4, 196, 205, 212
 Callimachus 201, 247, 251
 calque 167 n. 123, 205
 Camilla 249
 'casting of lots' motif 182, 212
 Catalogue of Ships 18, 41
 cento 88, 114, 151 n. 22, 160
 chain of reception 35–7, 168–9, 178, 181–2, 184, 186, 216; *see also* reception
 change of mind, of poet; *see* poet's 'change of mind'
Chanson de Roland 6, 59 n. 126, 110, 116, 134, 216 n. 368
 character on the sidelines 51, 132, 134, 136
 characterization 54–5, 99–100, 192
 character-specific elements 149, 153, 162, 257
 character-text
 alludes to alternative version 50, 53, 62, 65 n. 158, 74–5, 85, 93–6, 150, 172
 discrepant from narrator-text 93–4
 folktale in 212
 in Homer, spun into narrator-text in Epic Cycle (?) 124
 mythological catalogue in 187–8
 of Halitherses and Odysseus 41
 plays off narrator-text 155
 Chomsky, N. 223 n. 2, 227
Chrestomathia 231; *see also* Proclus
 chronological epic 240–1
 circularity 32–3, 103, 220 n. 391, 252
 City Dionysia 76–7
 Clay, J. S. 97
 cliché *see* topos
 clothes
 as token of recognition 49–50, 75
 black, for mourning 120
 'immortal' 65–6, 90
see also 'bathing and dressing'; motif
 coincidence 33, 58, 161, 213–14, 217, 221

- Colluthus 154
 Comedy, Old 9 n. 46, 30, 116; *see also*
 Aristophanes
 competitive relationship, between poems 54,
 70–1, 87, 90
 condensed style 80, 113 n. 45
 conflation *see* contamination
 connotation (connotative) 8, 35 (defined),
 107–16, 122–6, 128–9, 134–6, 260
 conscious and unconscious, in Homer 37,
 118, 129, 136–7 with n. 163, 144
 conservatism, in Greek epic tradition 76–7, 101
 contamination (*contaminatio*) 68, 172, 180,
 182, 213, 216
 Conte, G. B. 138–9
 contextual surplus 198
 contrast-imitation *see* opposition in imitation
 creative versus reproductive poets 76–7, 206
 Cretan tales 48, 50, 133, 151 n. 20
 ‘Cretan verses’, Zenodotus on 95
 Crete 49, 50, 201–2, 218 n. 380
 ‘cropping’, of poems of Epic Cycle 229
 Csapo, E. 195
 Ctesias 218
 cuneiform culture 164, 193–4
Cypria
 as ‘chronological’ epic 240–1
 doubling in 239 n. 1, 243
 embassy to Ithaca by Agamemnon and
 Menelaos 53, 141
 in the Proclian Summary 233
 omen at Aulis 41
 relationship with *Iliad* 2–3, 101, 124, 125
 n. 123, 151 n. 19, 154 n. 41
 significance of title 202
 Zeus’ plan in 2–3, 152 n. 27, 218 n. 378
 see also Index of Passages
 Cyprus 148, 165–7, 202–3, 219

 Čolaković, Z. 5, 13, 29 n. 185

 Ćor Huso 15 n. 90

 Danek, G. 5, 93, 95, 143, 214
 Daphnis 186 n. 211, 187–8, 198 n. 274, 207
 Dawn goddess 168 n. 130; *see also* Eos
 Deception of Zeus: *see* *Dios apate*
 Deianeira 129, 140
 déjà vu (in audience’s experience) 116, 128–9
 Dektes 51 n. 76
 Delphi 167–8
 Demeter 79–104, 235–8
 early hexameter hymns to 79–80,
 156 n. 52, 158
 immortalizes Demophon 180 n. 189
 love for Iasion 185
 paramour of Zeus 155

 Demodokos
 song of Ares and Aphrodite 150–1, 153,
 262
 song of quarrel of Agamemnon and
 Achilleus 27 n. 171, 136
 song of sack of Troy 122 n. 102, 214
 denotation 7, 35 (defined), 107, 109, 111, 116,
 125, 135–6; *see also* connotation
 departure, as ‘death’ 44 n. 31, 127–8, 226;
 see also warrior’s departure
 dependence, defined 35–6
 Deukalion 204–5
Deuteronokyia 53 n. 94, 59, 93, 125
 Di Benedetto, V. 46, 225
 dialogism 223
 dictation 7, 22
 differences versus similarities (in assessing
 dependence) 42, 174, 196
 digest *see* epitome
 Dike 199
 Diomedes
 and Achilleus 176, 196–7, 239
 and Athene 142, 176
 and Gilgamesh 174, 176 n. 172, 197
 captures horses of Aineias 142
 immortalized by Athene 180 n. 189
 kills Pandaros 177
 worsts Aineias 196
 wounds Aphrodite 173–8, 187–8, 196
 wounds Ares 140, 196–7
 Dione 167–8, 173, 197
Dios apate 147–60, 181–3
 as source for Pindar (?) 251 n. 34
 sources of 141, 156
 Dioskouroi 64 n. 152, 247
 direction of flow of narrative 197, 226,
 261–2
 direction of influence 17, 60, 123 n. 106,
 252, 262
 divine rescue, as type-scene (?) 64–5 n. 158;
 see also translation (transportation) from
 battlefield
Doloneia 16 n. 94, 24 n. 147, 33 n. 203, 242
 double transference *see* transferred motif,
 two-tier
 doublet(s)
 allusive 67 n. 170, 128–9, 176 n. 172, 226,
 239–45, 252 n. 50, 257
 and contextual surplus 198
 anticipatory 240 n. 9, 196
 establishing priority between 199 with
 n. 280, 239
 in Epic Cycle 239 n. 1, 242–5
 inclusionary and exclusionary 239–45
 see also surrogate, in narrative
 duals, in Iliadic Embassy 74, 95
 Dué, C. 122

- Dumuzi
 and Adonis 165
 and Gilgamesh 169, 171
 and Inanna / Ishtar 162, 170–1, 179, 185
 and Sumerian kings 161
 as Ama-ushumgal-ana 161, 169
 as shepherd 162, 169, 207; *see also*
 shepherd figures
 reception into Greek myth and cult
 165–6, 207
 sought in death by mother 91 n. 63
see also Dumuzi–Inanna songs; Tammuz
- Dumuzi–Inanna songs 37, 160–3, 169–72,
 178–81, 186, 193, 198, 220
- Ea 195, 207 n. 323, 218 n. 378
- Easterling, P. E. 116
- Edwards, M. W. 121
- eklogai* (ἐκλογαί): *see* epitome
- El 195, 207 n. 323
- Elektra 50
- Eleusis / Eleusinians 79, 83, 86–96, 97–9
- ellipse 62, 157, 165
- Embassy, to Achilles 18, 73–5
- embedded story 41, 51, 74–5, 99, 129, 172
- ‘encyclopedic’ epics 215
- ending, false 98
- Enkidu 23, 59 n. 126, 173, 177–8, 190, 197
 n. 272, 216–17
- Enlil 2, 3 n. 11, 152 n. 27, 181 n. 191, 195, 207
 n. 323
- Ennius 138
- Enuma elish* 67 n. 168, 192, 205 n. 309,
 207 n. 323, 218
- Eos
 and Memnon 63–4, 67, 89–90
 love for Orion 185
 love for Tithonos 179–80, 181, 185–6
- Epic Cycle 55–6
 and Homeric interpolation 95
 and neoanalysis 23, 89, 103, 124–5, 159
 as both motivationally prior and motivationally
 posterior to Homeric poems 100–1
 as deriving from Homeric poems 124–5
 as impervious to Homeric influence 16
 n. 95, 75
 as preserving pre-Homeric traditions 2, 75,
 124–5, 159, 178
 as reciprocally influencing Homeric
 poems 16 n. 95, 32
 conservatism of (compared to Homeric
 poems) 75–7
 differences from Homeric epic 77
 summaries of *see* Proclus
see also: *Aethiopis*; *Cypria*; *Epigoni*; *Little*
Iliad; *Iliou Persis*; *Thebaid*;
Theomachia; Proclus; Ovid and the Epic
 Cycle; Quintus of Smyrna and the Epic
 Cycle; Virgil and the Epic Cycle
- Epigoni* 26 n. 163, 27 n. 169, 39, 247
- Epimetheus 149
- epithets
αἰδοίη 209
βιατάς 251
ἰππηλάτα 250
ἰππότα 250
περίφρων 72 n. 205, 225
πολύμητις 210–11
φαίδιμος 113 n. 48
φιλομμειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη 209
χαλκοκορυστής 72
- epithet, ‘ornamental’ 8
- epitome 68 with n. 176, 230–3
- ‘equivalent’ 182, 193, 198, 205, 206
- Ereshkigal 27 n. 170, 170 n. 142, 189–93,
 195, 206–7
- Erra* 192
- Eryx (Mt) 165
- Ethiopians 60 n. 130
- etymology 65 n. 160, 107 n. 9, 167, 205
 folk- 98
- Eubouleus 84, 238 n. 21
- Eudemos of Rhodes 207
- Eumaios 84 n. 33, 131–3
- Eumelos 136
- Eumolpus 79
- Eupeithes 143
- Euripides
 ‘Alexandrian allusiveness’ in 25
 and ‘metatragedy’ 116 n. 67
 and suffering hero 44 n. 34
Cyclops as presupposing *Odyssey* 118–19
 doubling in 97 n. 97
Hippolytus plays 31–2
 inconsistency as allusive technique
 in 28 n. 177
 poetic memory in 139–40, 143
see also tragedy
- Eurykleia
 admitted into Telemachos’ and Odysseus’
 confidence 128 n. 132
 as surrogate for Penelope 51, 74, 130–1,
 132, 133
 in foot-washing scene 48–51, 130–1
 recognizes Odysseus 51, 130
 sheds ‘pregnant’ tears 51, 130–1
- Eurypylos 242, 243 n. 31, 244
- Evander 110
- evocation, defined 35
- evolutionary model (of Greek epic) 15–17,
 18–19; *see also* Nagy, G.; poem versus
 song-tradition
- exemplum, mythological 113 n. 45, 171–2,
 179–81, 186, 213, 250

- fable 201
Fable of the Fox 193–4
Faktenkanon 102
 fallacy
 genetic 166
 of audience limitation 30, 200, 220
 pathetic 170
 famine 91–3, 99
 fate, as figure for tradition 26, 36, 62, 98–9,
 121, 214 n. 358
 Feeney, D. 208
 fellow-feeling (*sympatheia*) 129, 134
 feminine perspective, on epic action 213–14;
 see also women in Homer
 Fielding, Henry 27 n. 170, 143–4
 filiation, as metapoetic metaphor 27
 film 30, 117, 145
 Finnegan, R. 13, 76–7
 fixed text(s)
 extent to which required for allusion 4–5
 distinct from written texts 21 with n. 125,
 37, 77, 198–9, 252
 in early Greek hexameter poetry 12–22, 75,
 102, 159, 252
 Iliad and *Odyssey* as 15–17, 40, 198
 **Memnonis* as 56, 72, 75
 see also evolutionary model; written texts;
 rhapsodic variation; variants
 floating motif 176, 199, 221
 flood myth 204–5
 flow of narrative, direction of: *see* direction of
 flow of narrative
 flower-gathering 79, 236 n. 13
 fluidity of text *see* fixed texts
 Foley, J. M. 4–7, 38, 256
 folktale 50, 154, 210–12
 foot-washing 51; *see also* *Niptra*
 foreign languages, Greek competence in 218
 foreignization 205–8, 218
 foreshadowing 51, 75, 107–11, 114, 120,
 128, 136
 formula(s)
 in Akkadian (?) 170–1, 192–3, 193–4
 adaptations of 88, 209–10
 and traditional referentiality 8, 12
 block 225, 257
 chains of (?) 17 n. 101, 225 n. 14
 ‘colloquial’ 141 n. 191
 underrepresented 10
 versus specific reprise 10–11, 45 with n. 44,
 158 with n. 62, 191 with n. 233, 257, 259
 see also allusion, via typical elements;
 epithet
 Foster, B. R. 192
 Fraenkel, E. 249
 frequency of motif 184, 190, 194, 261
 function, loss of 65, 177, 252–3; *see also*
 inconsequentiality
 funeral games 242
 Garner, R. 135
 Garvie, A. F. 142
 genre scene 163
 Gilgamesh
 and Dumuzi 169, 171
 and Enkidu 59 n. 126, 216
 and Sumerian Ur III kings 169
 as ‘Gilgames’ 206
 Greek ‘equivalents’ of 206; *see also*
 Achilleus, and Gilgamesh; Diomedes,
 and Gilgamesh; Odysseus, and
 Gilgamesh
 reviles Ishtar 169–72, 173, 178, 179, 185
 see also Bilgames
Gilgamesh
 ad hoc invention in 171–2
 and oral tradition 164 n. 99, 198–9 with
 n. 276
 diffusion of 194
 known to early Greek audiences? 219–20
 mise en abyme in 172
 motif transference in 23, 216–17
 mythological exemplum in 171–2
 Ninsun weeps in 110, 116
 opposition in imitation in 172
 poetic memory in 143
 reception of in early Greek epic 173–83,
 184–200, 215–17
 signalling in 171
 sophisticated allusion in 70, 172
 translated into Greek? 219–20
 see also Index of Passages
 girdle, of Aphrodite 27 n. 167, 152, 154, 155,
 157, 182
 gods
 as figures for the poet 51, 68, 116–17
 as figures for the tradition 66
 see also Athene, as figure for the poet; Zeus,
 plan of
 Graces (*Charites*) 149
 Hades 86, 91–2, 94, 98, 200, 207 n. 321,
 236 n. 4
 Hainsworth, J. B. 259, 262
 Haubold, J. 24
 Hazzi, Mt 203–4
 Hedammu (*Hedammu*) 163 n. 91, 189–90,
 193, 199, 202 n. 293
 Hekate 86–7, 89, 98, 100 n. 110
 Hektor
 and Andromache *see* Andromache, and
 Hektor

- and other Trojan champions 242
 and Sarpedon 69, 72
 combat with Achilles 49 n. 68, 61
 endangers Nestor 247–8, 252
 modelled on Memnon 57–62, 69, 72, 123
 n. 107, 127, 239–40, 241, 252, 262
 name etymologized 107 n. 9
 predicts Achilles' death 144–5
 ransoming of 42–5
 supplicates Achilles 45
- Helene
 and Odysseus (in *Ptocheia*) 51, 54, 139
 and Paris 154, 175, 182, 194
- Herodotus on 23
- Helios 86–7, 89, 98, 150
- Hephaistos 60–1, 150–1, 242
- Hera
 antagonistic relationship with
 Aphrodite 155, 156, 175, 196–7
 borrows Aphrodite's girdle *see* girdle of
 Aphrodite
 drubs Artemis 197
 makes cosmic oath 196 n. 262
 opposes Sarpedon's rescue 66–8, 90
 persecution of Herakles 140–1
 seduces Zeus 150–9, 181–2, 190
- Herakles
 and Gilgamesh 206
 and Iolaos 59 n. 126
 and Meleagros 129, 134
 and Nergal 205 n. 309
 and Odysseus 47 n. 54, 186
 and Theseus 239
 blown to Cos 141 n. 186
 immortalization of, suppressed in *Iliad* 64
 n. 152
 in pre-Homeric epic 47 n. 54, 53 n. 94, 141,
 151 n. 19, 206 n. 319
katabasis of 129, 139–40
 kills sea-monster (*ketos*) 141
 labours of 47, 141
- Hermes
 and Apollo 27 nn. 168–70, 150 n. 17
 and Pan 27 n. 169
 and ransoming of Hektor 42–4, 47
 dispatched to Kalypso 44, 47
 early hexameter hymns to 14 n. 80, 21
 n. 120, 24 n. 145, 85 n. 36, 156 n. 52
 escorts Persephone 97–9
- Herodotus
 and foreign language acquisition 218
 and neoanalytical thinking 23
 and the Homeric question 21 n. 126,
 as 'cutting and pasting' (?) 60 n. 129
 on Egyptian sources for Homer and
 Aeschylus 200 n. 283
- on Paris' return to Troy 229 n. 3, 233
 proleptic tears in 111
see also Index of Passages
- heroic choice 46 n. 46, 62, 154, 212 n. 345
- heroism 44, 46, 71, 107–8, 176 n. 172
- heroization 64–5; *see also* immortalization
- Hesiod
 abstention from travel 219
 and fixed texts 18, 21
 and Homer 224 n. 6
 and Near East 183–4, 201, 203–4,
 217–18
 and writing 18 with n. 103, 21
 changes of mind in 60–1 n. 129
 condensed style in 80
 local traditions in 201–2
 Pandora in 149
 presupposes early hexameter
 hymns 79–80, 156 n. 52
 punning in 201
 sense of authorship in 20 n. 119, 21
 succession myth in 167–8, 208–10
Works and Days alludes to *Theogony* 16,
 18, 224 n. 6
see also Index of Passages
- hiatus 88, 210
- Hinds, S. E. 9, 184, 186, 187, 190, 200
- Hippolytos 207
- Hittite poetry: *see* *Hedammu; Kingship in
 Heaven (Song of Birth); Ullikummi*
- Hölscher, U. 31, 225
- homecoming husband 50 n. 73, 212 n. 345,
 215 n. 363
- Homeric delicacy 100 n. 111
- 'Homeric' hymns
Aphrodite 24, 31, 37, 147–222 *passim*
Apollo 19–21, 27 nn. 168, 170, 103, 156
 n. 52
Ares 72 n. 204
Demeter 8, 24, 30, 31–2, 36–7, 79–104
Dionysos (HHom) 1) 151
Hermes 14, 21 n. 120, 24 n. 145, 27 nn.
 168–70, 39, 85 n. 36, 156 n. 52
Pan 24 n. 145, 27 n. 169, 39
see also Index of Passages
- Homeridai 20, 21, 77 n. 236; *see also*
 rhapsodes
- Homilia*: *see* Hektor and Andromache
- Hoplôn krisis* 61, 63, 241
- horse, motif of weeping 111 n. 36, 121–2
- Humbaba 110, 169, 176 n. 172, 193
- Hunter, R. L. 118
- Hypnos 64–5, 90, 155
- hypothesis of interaction with an assumed
 version 32–3, 66, 129, 257 n. 15
- hysteron proteron* 67

- Iapetos 204, 205 n. 310
 Iasion 185–6
 Iason 42 n. 26, 186, 212
 Ida, Mt 153–4, 157–8, 175, 187, 201 n. 286
Iddindagan A 161, 163 n. 86, 169 n. 136, 170
 ideal listener 28, 30–1, 37, 86, 92, 101, 126, 137; *see also* audience
Iliad and *Odyssey*
 differences between 39, 44, 135
 differences from Epic Cycle 77
 with n. 238
 ‘Odyssean’ elements in *Iliad* 40, 44 n. 34
 see also Index of Passages
Iliou Persis 112 n. 41, 113, 157 n. 55, 214, 240 n. 10; *see also* Index of Passages
 immortalization 46 n. 46, 63–6, 71, 73, 90, 143, 178, 180 n. 389
 implausibility 50, 211
 impropriety *see* propriety
 improvisation 13, 18 n. 106, 90
 Inanna
 and Dumuzi 161–3, 171, 179
 and kingship *see* kingship
 and seduction narratives 152, 193
 and Sumerian kings 161–3, 170
 and war 176
 ‘equivalents’ in Greece and Near East 193
 plaint in heaven by 195, 199
 propositions Bilgames 169
 threatens An 195
 see also: Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven; Dumuzi–Inanna songs; *Inanna and Shukaletuda*; royal hymns, Sumerian
Inanna and Shukaletuda 171–2
 incipits, and allusion 218
 inconcinnities 22, 243; *see also* narrative inconsistency
 incongruity 130, 140, 226
 inconsequentiality 34, 51, 87 n. 47, 130, 135, 252–3; *see also* function, loss of
 inconsistency, narrative *see* narrative inconsistency
 independent generation of motifs, etc. 161–2, 174, 239, 257; *see also* polygenesis; typology
 Indo-European inheritance 158 n. 62, 168 n. 130, 215 with n. 363
 innovation
 and inconsistency 63, 74, 90, 172 n. 152, 244
 importance of, in early Greek hexameter tradition 72–3, 75–6, 99
 in *Gilgamesh* 179
 in *HDem* 86, 88, 98
 in *Iliad* 60–1, 73–5
 in Pindar 250, 251 n. 34
 meant to be noticed 28 with n. 179, 54, 66, 172 n. 152
 see also conservatism
 intention, authorial 34
 interaction, defined 35
 interpolation 95, 243 n. 31
 concordance 160, 197 n. 268
 in Epic Cycle 229
 see also Epic Cycle, and Homeric interpolation
interpretatio 206
 interpretative gap 34, 35, 93, 112, 127, 131, 135, 136
 intertextual life, of fictional character 115–16, 118–19, 121
 intertextuality
 and bidirectional influence 17, 34, 159
 and traditional referentiality 9
 in Athenian drama 9, 139–40, 227
 with n. 22
 in performance culture 25, 30, 70, 75, 97 n. 93
 in South Slavic epic 5
 mythological 12, 35, 72, 85, 101, 173, 199
 ‘textless’ 12 n. 66, 102
 use of term 34
 see also intratextuality and intertextuality
 ‘intertraditionality’ 17, 159
 intratextuality
 in *Iliad* 69 n. 184, 109, 136, 140, 142, 196–7
 in *Odyssey* 259
 see also intratextuality and intertextuality (complementarity of)
 intratextuality and intertextuality (complementarity of) 11, 17–18, 42, 45, 50, 51, 58–9, 64, 114, 175, 181–2, 190–2, 198, 213, 224, 226, 257, 262
 invention, ad hoc 141, 143, 172, 179, 213
 inversions *see* opposition in imitation;
 Umkehr in der Wiederkehr des Gleichen
 Iphigeneia 124 nn. 115, 119, 139, 180 n. 189
 irony 46, 152, 181
 dramatic 54, 106, 114–15, 121, 145 n. 214
 Iros 136
 Ishtar 165–217
 and Dumuzi 165; *see also* Dumuzi, and Inanna / Ishtar
 and war 176–7
 antagonistic relationship with Ereshkigal 27 n. 170, 192
 in underworld 91 n. 63
 lovers of 171
 plaint in heaven by 167, 177, 193–4, 197–8
 propositions Gilgamesh 169, 170–1
 reviled by Gilgamesh *see* Gilgamesh, reviles Ishtar

- taunted by Enkidu 173
see also Inanna; Shaushka
Ishtar's Descent 27 n. 170, 152 n. 27, 191–2
 Ishullanu 171–2, 179, 188

 James, Henry 110, 134
 Janko, R. 16 with n. 92, 144, 156
 Japheth 204
 Jørgensen's law 144
 Judgement of Paris 149, 151, 154–6, 175
 Jupiter 67–8, 138

 Kakridis, J. T. 22, 172
 Kalyпсо 44, 46 n. 46, 49 n. 68, 66 n. 165, 180, 184–6
 Kasion, Mt *see* Hazzi, Mt
katabasis 91, 111, 129, 139; *see also* *Ishtar's Descent*
 Kelly, A. 188, 196, 248–52, 255–7
 Kern, O. 81
 kingship 154, 163, 166, 167
Kingship in Heaven (Song of Birth) 167–8, 209
 Kinyradai 167 n. 119
 Kinyras 167
 Kirke 111, 189 n. 226
 Kleopatra (wife of Meleagros) 74–5
 Kolaković, Mehmed 113 n. 45
 Kraljević, Marko 5 n. 19, 111 n. 36, 121
 Kristeva, J. 9
 Kronos 167, 207 n. 323, 210, 218 n. 378
 Kumarbi 167, 190
 Kyknos 242

 Laertes 55, 128 n. 132, 190–1
 lament 70 n. 185, 106–7, 110, 114, 119–22, 124, 165; *see also* lamentation, prospective
 lamentation, prospective 111, 255–8
 Laomedon 141
 Latin poetry, and Homeric criticism 4, 9, 24, 25–6, 37, 138–9, 145, 184, 186, 216; *see also* Ovid; Virgil
 laughter (in Homer) 92–3, 106, 135–6
 Lausus 248–9
 Lavinia 133–4
 Leto 155, 197
 life-history, of fictional character 115–16, 118–19, 121, 129, 143–4; *see also* intertextual life, of fictional character
 Litai 199
 literacy
 and the Homeric / Hesiodic poems 6–7, 18, 22, 28, 193
 in Mesopotamia 164
Little Iliad
 and Demodokos' third song 214
 as 'chronographic' epic 240 n. 10
 as (indirect) 'source' of *Iliad* 23, 85, 112, 125, 159
 as cento of *Iliad* 88 n. 49, 114, 160
 as depending on *Iliad* 112 with n. 44, 124
 as preserving pre-Homeric phrasing 114, 159
 condensed style in 112–13
 Eurypylos in 242, 244
 Hoplōn krisis in 241 n. 18
 Ptocheia in 51 n. 76
 see also Index of Passages
 local traditions 77 n. 238, 165, 201–3, 251 n. 34; *see also* Panhellenism
 Lohmann, D. 258
Lola rennt 117–18, 129, 138, 145
 Lord, A. B. 4 n. 13, 5–8, 13, 18 n. 106
 loss of function *see* function, loss of
 Lydians 201
 lying tales 53, 151, 155
 Lykaon 74 n. 212, 115
 Lyne, R. O. A. M. 133

 Machinist, P. 192
 magic 129, 206
 main story, versus embedded story 99, 214;
 see also character-text
 marked(ness) and meaningful(ness)
 defined 33–5
 in allusion 11, 42, 46, 174, 199, 207, 221, 227, 261
 meaningful(ness), in putative allusion 176, 207, 259; *see also* markedness and meaningfulness
 Mededović, Avdo 5, 15–16 n. 90, 110, 111 n. 36, 113 n. 45, 214–15; *see also* Alija, Vlahinjić; Bosnian heroic song
 Mekone 202
 Meleagros
 in *Iliad* 31 n. 194, 74–5, 142, 172, 214
 in Bacchylides 129, 134
 Melqart 205
 Memnon
 absent from *Iliad* 59, 71
 and Aeneas 248–9
 and Hektor 58, 59–60, 69, 72, 123 n. 107, 127, 239, 241, 242–3, 248, 252 n. 50
 and Sarpedon 59–60, 64–6, 69, 72, 87 n. 46, 89–90, 123 n. 107
 as χαλκοκορυστής 72
 as post-Iliadic 59, 242 with n. 24
 endangers Nestor 247–8
 has divinely made armour 49 n. 68, 60
 immortalization of 63, 65–6, 180 n. 189
 in **Memnonis (Aethiopsis)* 55–66
 killing of Antilochos 248

Memnon (*cont.*)

Thetis prophesies about (*Aethiopsis*) 61–2
translated to Ethiopia by Eos 64

**Memnonis* see *Aethiopsis*

memorization 13, 18

Menelaos

at death of Patroklos 57, 126
friendship with Antilochos 127 n. 127
in embassy to Ithaca 141
in embassy to Troy 142
quarrel with Antilochos 136
recognized by Helene by his clothes (?) 50
n. 71

Mesopotamian literature

allusion in 25–9, 70, 172, 191–3, 213, 215
and oral tradition 164
reception of, in Greek hexameter
poetry 37, 176–7, 217–18, 220
transmission of 164
see also Akkadian poetry; Near Eastern
poetry; Sumerian poetry

metacyclic, Homeric poems as 77 n. 238
metalepsis 105–6, 116–19, 140, 143 n. 203,
144 n. 209

metaphor and allusion 109 n. 26, 112, 135

metapoetry 26–7, 36, 94, 97 n. 97, 152, 171

Mezentius 248, 250

mirror-story 52 n. 88, 53, 172, 214, 224

misdirection 53

mise en abyme 172, 214

Momos 205 n. 309, 218 n. 378

Mondi, R. 196

'Monro's law' 71

Mopsos 205 n. 309

motif transference see transferred motif

motival priority see priority, motival

motivation, actorial 34, 92–3, 99, 127

Mueller, M. 198

multiforms 15–16; see also independent
generation

multiple correspondence, between 'source'
and 'target' 47, 58, 69–70, 226

Mummu 205 n. 309, 207 n. 323, 218 n. 378

Murad I (Sultan) 145

Musaeus 79, 80 n. 11, 83 n. 28

Mysia see Teuthrania

mystery cults 30, 79 n. 5, 104

Mythographus Homericus 23, 69 n.
179, 233

myth versus poetry, in early Greek poetic
receptions 23, 38, 72, 85, 101–2, 105,
114, 141, 172–3, 195, 199 with n. 278,
221; see intertextuality, mythological

mythography, and Trojan war 241

mythological catalogue 171, 173, 178–89,
216, 224

mythological exemplum see exemplum,
mythological

mythological intertextuality see intertextuality,
mythological

mythology, and neoanalysis 23, 101, 105, 107,
113, 114, 127, cf. 199 with n. 278; see also
intertextuality, mythological

Nagy, G. 10, 15, 17, 18

names, in early Greek epic 204–8

Namtar 195

narrative inconsistency 27, 34, 35, 36, 48, 52–4,
61, 66, 74, 85, 89–93; see also character-
text, discrepant from narrator-text

narrative logic 31, 34, 52, 117–18, 144, 145

narrative surprise 98, 132, 193

narrator-text see character-text

naturalization see assimilation

Nausikaa 43–4, 49 n. 68, 67 n. 168, 189–90,
193, 259, 261

Near Eastern poetry

and Demeter-Persephone myth 91 n. 63,

98 n. 100, 152 with n. 27

and neoanalysis 24 n. 146, 55 n. 102, 211,
217, 222

awareness of, on part of Greek

audiences 30, 210, 212–13, 219–22

reception of, in Greek hexameter

poetry 24, 37, 55, 154, 160–222

see also Mesopotamian poetry

nekyia 27, 53, 93–4

neoanalysis

and allusion 22, 34, 212

and analysis 22, 48, 95

and folktale 211

and **Memnonis* (*Aethiopsis*) 56–63, 85–6,
89–90, 120, 127, 129, 248, 253

and motif transference see transferred motif

and Near Eastern material see Near Eastern
poetry, and neoanalysis

and *Odyssey* 23–4 with n. 143, 131

and oralists see oralists

and 'refiguration' and 'transplantation' 195
with n. 259

as *motivgeschichtliche Forschung* 22 n.
132, 101

audience perspective in 48, 86 n. 40, 212
n. 350

concerned with mythology or poetics see
mythology, and neoanalysis

expanded 23–4, 103, 105, 159, 160–1

history of 22–3

'old' and 'new' 34, 48, 95, 212

on relationship of Homer and Epic

Cycle 75–6, 100–1, 112–13, 124–5, 159

term 22

- Neoptolemos 27 n. 169, 110 n. 28, 113, 243–4
- Nereids
 at Achilles' death 57, 66 n. 165, 85–6, 120, 123 n. 108, 125–6, 255
 at Patroklos' death 57, 85–6, 119–20, 125–6, 255
 catalogue of 18
- Nergal 170 n. 142, 189–92, 205 n. 309, 207 n. 321
- Nergal and Ereshkigal* 27 n. 170, 163 n. 91, 189–92; *see also* Index of Passages
- Nestor
 as figure for the poet 142 n. 192
 'horseman' 250
 in difficulty 247–52
 and Patroklos 62, 74, 127 n. 126
 and Phoinix 74
 'new songs' 72–3, 76
- Nibelungenlied* 6, 109 n. 22, 110, 116, 134
- Ninegal 169
- Ninsun 110, 116, 189 n. 225
- Niobe 172
- Niptra* 51, 130–1; *see also* foot-washing
- Noah 204
- nod, Homeric 54, 95
- Nonnus 204
- notional alternative versions 12, 31–2, 54, 126, 131, 134, 137; *see also* reifying alternative version; 'simple story'
- Oakley, J. H. 108
- Obilić, Miloš 145
- Ocean, Homer as 69 n. 179; *see also* Okeanos
- Odysseus
 addicted to disguise 55
 and Achilles *see* Achilles, and Odysseus
 and arms of Achilles: *see Hopleon krisis*
 and clothes 49–50, 66 n. 165
 and Gilgamesh 186 with n. 212, 193, 206 with n. 319
 and Hektor 47, 70 n. 185, 226
 and Jason 143, 186, 212
 and Kalypso *see* Kalypso
 and Penelope *see* Penelope
 and Priamos 47, 70 n. 185, 72
 and *Ptocheia*: *see Ptocheia*
 and Telemachos *see* Telemachos
 as departed / 'dead' 43–4
 as dry-eyed 132
 as father of Telemachos 40 n. 8
 as Outis 210–11
 bathes and dresses 189–91
 heroic choice of 46 n. 46
 homecoming of, as folktale motif 212 n. 345
 homecoming of, brought into increasingly sharp focus in *Odyssey* 224–5
 homecoming of, in pre-Homeric poetry 47–55, 93
 homecoming of, length of 50
 in embassy to Achilles 73
 in embassy to Troy 142
 in *Iliad* 40 n. 8
 kills Astyanax 113 n. 47
 life-history and intertextual life of, confused 118
 offered immortality by Kalypso 46 n. 46, 180 n. 189
 prostrates Iros 136
 quarrels with Achilles (Demodokos' second song) 136
 recalls omen at Aulis 41, 142
 recognitions of *see* Eurykleia; Penelope
 refuses Eurymachos' supplication 45
 rescues Achilles' body 57
 smiles 136 n. 160
 tells lying tale 48 n. 57, 151 n. 20
 undergoes 'pains' 44
 weeps 122 n. 102, 132, 214
- Oidipous 139
- Okeanos 151, 155, 182 with n. 198, 204; *see also* Ocean, Homer as
- Old English poetry: *see Battle of Finnesburh; Beowulf*
- 'old' versus 'new' neoanalysis *see* neoanalysis, 'old' and 'new'
- Olson, S. D. 117
- opposition in imitation
 and meaningfulness 34, 182, 186, 225
 and *Umkehr* in *Wiederkehr* 27 and n. 173, 224
 defined 27
 in *Gilgamesh* 169–71, 193
 in Greek and Near Eastern poetry 37, 178–82, 186, 213, 216
 in *HDeM* 87
 in *Nergal and Ereshkigal* 192
 in Quintus 123
 in Virgil 68–9, 249
 with *HApH* and *Iliad* 155–6, 157, 180, 181
 with *Iliad* and *Odyssey* 44
 with **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* and *Iliad* 67, 248 n. 9
 with *Odyssey* and earlier poetry on Odysseus' homecoming 54
 with similes 260–1
 see also reversals
- oral and literary techniques 28 with n. 177, 69 with n. 181, 104, 145–6, 215
- oral poetry 4–29, 56, 76, 96 n. 92, 102, 104, 223

- 'oral-derived' 6–7, 18, 25, 215, 228
oralists 9 n. 48, 10, 27, 48, 95, 255 n. 6
orality and literacy, compatibility of 6; *see also*
 literacy; written texts
Orestes 50, 59 n. 126
Orion 185–6
Orpheus 79, 86, 235
Orphic *Theogony* 183, 217
Ouranos 167, 168 n. 130, 209–10, 218 n. 378
Outis (*Oὐτις*) 211
Ovid
 allusion in 215
 and Epic Cycle 41 n. 17, 55
 indicates provenance of Philemon and
 Baucis tale 201
 'many mouths' motif in 187, 200
 Nestor in 142 n. 192
 poetic memory in 138
 'traditionality' of 26, 145–6
- Page, D. L. 71
Pallas (son of Evander) 67–8, 110
Pamphos 79–80
Pandaros 177
Pandora 149
Panhellenism 77 n. 238, 99, 202–3, 220
Panyassis 204, 207 n. 321, 232
Paphos 148–9, 153, 167, 202 n. 293
paralepsis 145 n. 211
para-narrative 214; *see also* embedded story;
 mirror-story; *mise en abyme*; song within
 a song
- Paris
 and Aphrodite 154, 157, 175
 and Dumuzi 207
 and Helene *see* Helene, and Paris
 and 'Hero's Choice of Life' 154
 kills Achilles 57, 127, 144, 239–40
 return to Troy 229 n. 3, 233
 shoots Nestor's horse 247–8
 see also Judgement of Paris
- Parry, M. 6 n. 28, 10, 15 n. 90
Pasquali, G. 4
passive heroism 44
pathetic fallacy *see* fallacy, pathetic
- Patroklos
 allusive doublet of Achilles 57, 69, 72–3,
 86, 90, 120, 123, 271, 239–40
 and Antilochos 23, 57, 58–9, 69, 73, 74,
 126–30, 134, 197, 239–40, 241, 262
 and Enkidu 23, 59 n. 126, 197 n. 272,
 216–17
 and Iliadic Embassy 73–5
 and Phoinix 74–5, 197
 as Achilles' 'best friend' 59 and n. 126, 67
 n. 168, 216, 242, 244–5
 as invention of *Iliad* poet (?) 73 n. 209
 death of 37, 71 n. 198, 86, 119–23
 funeral games for 135–6, 222, 242
 wears Achilles' armour 27 n. 167, 60, 152
 wept for by Briseis 106–7, 122
- Peisistratos (son of Nestor) 107
Peisistratos (son of Hippokrates) *see*
 Pisistratean recension
- Peleus 60, 107, 180 n. 189, 212 n. 345
Pelias 242
- Penelope
 actorial motivation of 92–3
 age of 243
 and Arete 49–50, 54, 225
 and Eurykleia *see* Eurykleia
 and the unconscious 136
 as complicit in the killing of the
 suitors 52–3, 73, 93, 131
 beautifies herself 148–9, 152
 characterization of 54–5
 compared to shipwrecked man 259–61
 laughs 92–3, 136
 recognizes Odysseus 49–52, 73–5, 90, 130–1
 reproved by Telemachos 46, 224–6, 257
 reunited with Odysseus 259–61
 sorrows for Odysseus / Telemachos 70
 n. 185, 128, 257
 trumps / upstages Odysseus 191 n. 231, 260
 with n. 14
 unimpressed by Odysseus bathing 190, 193
- Penthesileia 56, 124, 242, 249
performance culture 25, 70, 75, 104; *see also*
 audience
- Persephone
 and Ereshkigal 207 n. 321
 rape of 79–100, 236
 see also flower-gathering
- persiflage 252; *see also* cento
- Pestalozzi, H. 22
- Phaeacians 43–5, 49, 142, 225, 239
- Phayllos 230, 232
- Phemios 97 n. 94, 224–5
- Philo of Byblos 207; *see also* Index of Passages
- Philostratus 248
- Phoenician(s) 164–6, 204, 205 n. 309, 207
 n. 323
- Phoinix (Achilles' tutor) 45, 73–5, 130, 142,
 197, 214
- Phoinix (= 'Phoenician') 204
- Photus 229–32
- Pindar
 allusive art in 25
 and *Aethiopis* 55, 63–4, 120, 125, 247–53
 and Epic Cycle 247
 mythological invention in 250
 on new songs 76

- Pisistratean recension 77
 place names, inscribing story's
 provenance 201–4
 plaint in heaven 177, 179 n. 186, 193–8,
 199–200, 215–16
 poem versus song-tradition 15–19, 34 n. 209,
 36, 40, 56, 72, 102, 159
 poet's 'change of mind' 59 with n. 129
 poetic justice 177
 poetic memory
 and the 'mythological catalogue' 188 n. 222
 as a trope of allusion 26, 47 with n. 56
 in *Gilgamesh* 143
 in Homer 140–6
 in Latin poetry 26 n. 165, 138
 in Quintus 138 n. 170
 in tragedy 139–40
 introduced by *ἡ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε (vel sim.)* 53,
 139–41
 relationship to 'pregnant tears' 106, 144
 Polybius, proleptic tears in 111
 polygenesis 214–16, 221–2; *see also*
 independent generation of motifs
 Polyphemos 70, 210–11
 Poseidon 141, 153 n. 38, 196, 202, 224,
 250 n. 31
 posteriority, *motival see* priority, *motival*
 pregnant tears *see* tears, pregnant
 prequel 26, 39–40, 125
 Priamos 42–5, 47, 70 n. 185, 72, 107,
 109 n. 21, 112 n. 43
 primary and secondary motifs 10, 86, 87, 96,
 100–1, 150–2, 178 n. 184, 190, 191, 226
 n. 17; *see also* direction of influence;
 priority, *motival*; stemmatic relationships
 between poems
 priority, *motival* 63, 101, 110, 113–14, 150,
 153, 158, 159, 161, 178, 199
 Proclus
 date of 55
 summaries of Cyclical epics 55–6, 229–33
 prolepsis 57, 71, 86, 109, 110–11, 120–2,
 136, 256
 Prometheus 201–2
 Propertius 122–6
 prophecy
 as figure for poetic tradition 26
 about Aineias 158
 of Halitherses 41
 of Kalchas 41, 139
 of Theoklymenos 136 n. 163
 of Thetis to Achilles 61–2
 post euentum 20 with n. 117
 'recalled' 41
 propriety, of motif in narrative context 34, 50,
 110, 130, 133–5, 152, 226
 Pseudo-Apollodorus
 and Trojan war 230–1, 241–4, 248
 epitomized 230 n. 10, 231 n. 15, 232 n. 22
 on Typhon 203
 use of digests 230
Ptocheia 51, 139
 puns (in Hesiod, Homer, and
 folktale) 210–11
 Pythagoras, in Near East 218–19
 Quintus of Smyrna
 Achilleus avenging Antilochos in 58
 and Epic Cycle 32, 122–6, 232, 249
 and Homeric motif transference 23, 64 nn.
 154, 156, 122–3
 and Latin poetry 124 n. 113
 as 'chronological epic' 241
 as reacting to cues in the Homeric
 text 123–6
 death of Antilochos in 248
 Nestor in 142 n. 192
 omen at Aulis in 41 n. 19
 on Sarpedon and Memnon 64 nn. 154, 156,
 123 n. 107
 quotation
 as technique of allusion 36, 213
 defined (verbatim and non-verbatim) 35
 with nn. 213–14
 in *Gilgamesh* 172, 213
 in *HDem* 37, 85–9, 95–6, 102
 in Virgil 68–9
 narrative inconsistency as a form of 28
 n. 177, 54, 95
 with *Cypria* and *Iliad* 2–3, 159
 with *HAph* and *Iliad* 158, 159–60
 with *Iliad* and *Odyssey* 40–1, 45–6, 224–6
 with *Little Iliad* and *Iliad* 114, 159
 with **Memnonis (Aethiopis)* and *Iliad* 61,
 63, 71–2, 86, 120–1, 159
 Rarian plain 98
 reception, defined 35
 recognition, type-scene of 49, 53; *see also*
 Eurykleia, recognizes Odysseus;
 Penelope, recognizes Odysseus
 (re-)composition in performance 13–22, 48, 77
 Redfield, J. M. 108
 refiguration 35 (defined), 174, 195, 198,
 205–9, 248, 250
 reifying alternative version 32, 49, 75, 123,
 137; *see also* notional alternative versions
 Reinhardt, K. 175
 reperformance 13, 20, 76–7, 102; *see also*
 tragedy, reperformance of
 restricted application (of phrasing or motif)
 149, 152, 162, 197

- reversals *see* opposition in imitation; *Umkehr*
in Wiederkehr des Gleichen
 rhapsodes 14, 15–16, 20–1, 76, 77
 rhapsodic variation 14, 21 n. 120, 81–3, 158
 n. 62, 166 n. 116; *see also* variants
 Rheia 97–100
 Rhesos 24 n. 147, 33 n. 203, 242
 ‘rhetoric of traditionality’ 28, 54
 ring-composition 97–8
 ringing the changes (on a motif) 37, 185, 191,
 216, 224, 227
 Roland 59 n. 126, 110; *see also* *Chanson de*
 Roland
 royal hymns, Sumerian 161–4, 166, 169–72,
 173, 177, 193, 216; *see also*: *Iddindagan*
 A; *Shulgi X*
 royal inscriptions, Assyrian 164 n. 99, 176
 Rutherford, R. B. 25, 46

 sacred marriage
 of Enlil and Ninlil 181 n. 191
 of Sumerian kings and Inanna *see* royal
 hymns, Sumerian
Sack of Troy: *see* *Iliou Persis*; Index of Passages
 Sale, W. M. 8–9
 Šarac (horse) 111 n. 36, 121
 Sarpedon 57, 60, 64, 72–3, 89–90, 123 n. 107
 Saussure, F. de 223, 227
 Schein, S. L. 13
 Scodel, R. 137
 scribal tradition (Near Eastern) 29, 193, 194
 secondary narrative / secondary narrator *see*
 character-text
 seduction
 and bathing and dressing 147–56, 161–3,
 169–71, 189–93
 and mythological catalogue 188
 and plaint in heaven 194
 in early Greek hexameter poetry 147–57
 in Greek and Near Eastern poetry
 161–3, 216
 in *Iliad* and *Gilgamesh* 174–6
 in Sumerian poetry 161–3
 of Zeus by Hera 181–2; *see also* *Dios apate*
 performed by unlikely seductresses 152, 192
 putative type-scene of 148–9, 155, 161–2,
 196 n. 262
 simple or complex 189–90
 self-consciousness
 and poetic memory 144
 in adapting folktale elements 210–11
 in adapting foreign material 208, 212
 in allusion 25, 37, 70, 97–9, 137, 145, 215
 in Euripides 140
 in *HDeM* 97–9
 in *Gilgamesh* 179
 in Homeric epic 38, 140, 145, 181, 217
 in *Odyssey* 52, 54, 96, 214, 260 n. 14
 with mythological catalogue 188
 viz-à-viz tradition 18, 28, 66, 116, 118, 145,
 179; *see also* ‘rhetoric of traditionality’
 sequel 26, 39, 42
 Serbian heroic song 5, 50, 111, 113 n. 45,
 121, 145
 Shamhat 190
 Shaushka *see* Ishtar
 shepherd figures 186; *see also* Anchises,
 Boutes, Daphnis, Dumuzi
Shulgi X161, 169 n. 136, 170 nn. 137–8
 Shukaletuda 117, 179; *see also* *Inanna and*
 Shukaletuda
 sibling relationships (metapoetic) 27, 192
 signalling of the ‘source’
 as trope of allusion 26, 36
 in *Cypria* 243–4
 in early Greek hexameter poetry 208
 in *Gilgamesh* 171, 179
 in Greek and Near Eastern poetry 213
 in Hesiod 201–2, 209
 in *Iliad* 59, 66, 128, 136, 152, 154, 157, 159,
 175, 196
 in *Nergal and Ereshkigal* 192
 in *Odyssey* 47, 128, 132, 143, 257
 in Quintus 123
 in tragedy 26 n. 162
 in Virgil 26 n. 162, 67, 249
 via place-names 201–3
 similarities versus differences *see* differences
 versus similarities (in assessing
 dependence)
 similes 44, 132, 133 n. 152, 162, 214, 216,
 259–62
 ‘simple story’ 12, 31–2, 35, 47 n. 54, 54, 199
 Sindbad 212
 Sin-lēqi-unninni 169, 179
 situation-specific elements *see* character-
 specific elements
 Skylla 31 n. 194, 111
Sliding Doors 117 n. 74
 Solon 76 n. 229
Song of Roland *see* *Chanson de Roland*
 song within a song 27, 151, 213–14; *see also*
 para-narrative
 Sophocles
 active heroism in 44
 allusion to *Iliad* in (*Ajax*) 70, 227 n. 22
 deus ex machina in (*Philoctetes*) 98
 multiple-correspondence allusion in 70
 poetic memory in 139, 204
 Triptolemus 84 n. 32
 trope of ‘filiation’ in 27 n. 169
 see also tragedy

- Sotiriou, M. 252
- South Slavic poetry 4–6, 13, 21 n. 120, 28, 145, 162, 215; *see also* Bosnian heroic song; Serbian heroic song
- speaking names 205
- specific reprise
defined 35–6
versus typologically generated
repetition 10–11, 33, 35–6, 147, 149–50, 188–9, 190–1, 193, 197–8, 224, 256–8, 259–62
- sphragis* 19–20
- spilling, as symbol 130–1
- stand-in *see* surrogate
- stemmatic relationships (between poems) 10, 184, 190, 199
- Strabo, *Chrestomathy* 231–2
- structuralism 223
- succession myth
Hesiodic 167–8, 208–9
Orphic 209 n. 332
Phoenician (of ‘Sanchuniathon’) 207 n. 323
- suggestio falsi* 110
- Sun *see* Helios
- suitors (of Penelope) 41–2, 46, 49, 52–4, 73, 90, 93, 128 n. 132, 131, 136, 193, 225
- Sumerian poetry
influence on Greek poetry 163–4
see also *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven*; *Bilgames*, *Death of*; *Dumuzi–Inanna* songs; *Iddindagan A*; *Inanna and Shukaletuda*; royal hymns, Sumerian; *Shulgi X*
- supplication
of Achilles by Agamemnon and Hektor 45
of Achilles by Priamos and of Arete by Odysseus 42–5, 47, 72
of Hekabe by Odysseus 139
of Nausikaa by Odysseus 44
of Kyklops by Odysseus 44
of Odysseus by Eurymachos 45
of Zeus by Thetis 63–4, 199, 247
- ‘surface’ and ‘deep’ layers of narrative 31, 89–93
- surplus, of emotion 107, 134
- surrogate, within narrative 66, 72–3, 128 n. 132, 130, 132–4, 197; *see also* doublet
- symbolism 105–9, 113–14, 119–23, 125, 126, 128, 130–2, 135
- synecdochic narratives 1–2, 240–1
- synthesizing of myths 244–5
- Tammuz 165
- Taplin, O. 259
- Teichoskopia 142
- tears
pregnant 34, 47, 51, 105–37 *passim*, 144
proleptic 110–11
see also lamentation, prospective
- Telemachos
admires transformed Odysseus 191
age of 243
as doublet / surrogate for Odysseus 128, 257
Penelope weeps for 256–7
reproves Penelope 46, 224–6
weeps for Odysseus 107
welcomed by Eumaios 131–3
- Telemachy 128
- Telephos 243 n. 31, 244
- Telipinu 91 n. 63, 98 n. 100
- ten years, as duration of epic action 41, 243–4
- tension, in narrative *see* interpretative gap
- Teshub 167
- Tethys 151, 182, 204, 207 n. 323
- Teuthranian campaign 50 n. 73, 124 nn. 115 and 119, 243–5
- textual tradition 13, 15
- textual transmission 102, 160, 199 n. 276
- Thanatos 64–5, 90
- Thebaid* 24 n. 147, 27 n. 169, 39; *see also* Index of Passages
- theft, as metapoetic metaphor 27
- Theocritus 26, 187–8
- Theoklymenos 136 n. 163
- Theomachia* 224
- Theseus 59 n. 126, 138, 239
- Thesmophoria 91 n. 62
- Thetis
and Kalypso 44, 46
despairs of welcoming Achilles again 46, 70 n. 185
laments at Achilles’ funeral 120, 123 n. 108, 125, 255
laments at Patroklos’ death 85–6, 119–21, 125–6, 255
performs plaint before Zeus 199
prophesies to Achilles 57, 61–2
supplicates Zeus for Achilles’ immortality 63, 67, 247
wedding with Peleus 212 n. 345
- Thon 205
- Thrasyboulos (son of Xenokrates) 250
- threat of cosmic violence 195
- Tiamat 218 n. 378; *see also* Tethys
- toilette, goddess’s 147–53, 161–3, 178–81, 189–90, 193, 202
- topos 9, 108, 171, 184, 186, 194
- Tradition (capitalized) 12, 223, 224, 228
- ‘tradition’ (‘traditional’), meanings of 25–6, 153, 188, 216

- traditional referentiality 3–9, 12, 79 n. 1, 85, 95 n. 85, 101, 223, 228, 255 n. 6; *see also* type-scene, audience familiarity with exploited
- tragedy
allusion in 9 with n. 46, 139
allusive poetics in, comparable to Homeric 24, 37
and Epic Cycle 55
audience of 29 n. 186, 30, 104 n. 130, 220
gods as figure for dramatist in 51, 116–17
inconsistency in 28 n. 177
lying tales in 151 n. 20
metalepsis in 116
official texts of 77
old and new plays 76
plot innovations in 99
reperformance of 76
topos and specific allusion in 9
traditional characters in 145
tropes of allusion in 26–8
see also Aeschylus; Euripides; Sophocles
- transferred motif
and neoanalysis 10, 23, 87, 109–10, 129
and ‘pregnant’ tears 134–7
and ‘propriety’ 34, 50, 109–10
and Quintus 23, 123
first- and second-order 216–17
in Greek and Near Eastern poetry 169–70, 195–6, 213, 216–17
in *HDem* 85–7
in *Iliad* 66–8, 72–5, 85–6, 113–14, 129, 136, 152, 159, 176, 181, 253
in *Nergal and Ereshkigal* 191
in *Odyssey* 50, 128, 130, 132, 136, 152
in Virgil 67–8, 133–4
two-tier 73, 130, 176, 197
versus typical motif 10
see also propriety of a motif in narrative context
- transitional texts 6–7, 28
- translation (= calquing) 205, 207
- translation (cultural) 166–8, 177, 198, 207, 212; *see also* ‘equivalent’
- translation (= transportation) from
battlefield 63, 64–5, 71
- translations of Near Eastern poetry into Greek (?) 218, 219–20
- transliteration 205–8
- transplantation 195, 206–7
- trespass, within narrative 109, 113
- Triptolemos 86–7, 98, 238 n. 21
- tropes of allusion 26–9, 36, 47 n. 56
- truth and poetic tradition 96
- Turnus 61 n. 136, 133–4
- type-scene
and ‘recurring motif’ 111
as vehicle of allusion 11, 43
audience familiarity with, exploited 12, 53, 228; *see also* traditional referentiality
- compositional utility of 111
- inadequate to account for given
similarities 43, 87, 149–50, 161–2, 189, 190–1, 195–8, 226
- versus specific reprise *see* specific reprise
see also arming; bath; divine rescue; lament; recognition; seduction; warrior’s departure
- Typhaon *see* Typhon
- Typhoeus 201; *see also* Typhon
- Typhon 168 n. 127, 201, 203, 204, 205 n. 310
- typical motifs 10
- typology
and doublets 239, 242
and Greek–Mesopotamian parallels 215 n. 366
and *Iliad* and **Memnonis* (*Aethiopis*) 56
with n. 112, 58 with n. 120, 252 n. 50
versus specific reprises *see* specific reprise, versus typologically generated repetition
versus stemmatic relationships 10
- two-tier transference *see* transferred motif, two-tier
- Ullikummi (*Ullikummi*) 163 n. 91, 179 n. 186, 189–90, 193–4, 199, 202 n. 293, 203–4
- Umkehr in (der) Wiederkehr (des Gleichen)*
and opposition in imitation 27 n. 173, 224, 225–6 with n. 16
in *Iliad* 64, 261
in *Odyssey* 190–1, 260
- unconscious *see* conscious and unconscious, Homeric concept of
- unique recurrence 45
- unitarianism 22, 48, 59 n. 129
- usage-based linguistics 227
- Utnapishtim 143, 178, 207 n. 323
- variants
oral 85 n. 36, 102
textual 15, 81 n. 19, 83 n. 28, 167 n. 120
see also rhapsodic variation
- Venetos A 55, 230–2
- vengeance theme
in *Iliad* 58, 127 with n. 128
in Quintus 58
- Virgil
and Epic Cycle 55–6, 68–9, 229 n. 3, 232, 248–9

- and Homeric allusion 3, 8–9, 25 n. 154,
36–7, 68–70, 215
and Homeric motif transference 23, 67–8
as reader of Homer 61 n. 136, 65, 67–70,
167 n. 120, 203 n. 296
‘many mouths’ motif in 184 n. 202,
186–7, 200
‘pregnant’ tears in 133–4
see also Latin poetry
Višnjić, Filip 5 n. 19, 111 n. 36, 121 n. 94
- warrior’s departure 108–10, 113, 226
Wedding of Vlahinjić Alija: see Alija,
Vlahinjić
weeping, proleptic *see* lamentation,
prospective
West, M. L. 59, 61–2, 71, 163, 230, 242
‘when’-words 139, 188 n. 222
window reference 69 n. 180, 169, 180 with
n. 190, 182, 186, 216
women, in Homer 44 with n. 36, 148; *see also*
feminine perspective; Andromache;
Arete; Briseis; Eurykleia; Helene;
Kalypso; Nausikaa; Penelope
words of iteration 26, 67, 132, 141–2, 188
Worm and Toothache 193–4
Wright, M. 140
- writing *see* literacy
written texts 14, 104, 180, 252; *see also* fixed
texts
- Xanthos (and Balios) 121, 144 n. 208
Xanthus 218
Xenokrates (Emmenid) 250
- Zenodotus 1 n. 1, 22, 95
Zeus
and Anu 167, 173, 197, 205
and Baal 167 n. 123
and Delphic stone 168
and Demeter 91, 98–9, 155, 235
and Dione 167, 168 n. 130, 173, 197
and Ganymedes 67 n. 168, 179, 181
and Hera: *see* *Dios apate*
and Sarpedon 66–7
and Teshub 167
Cretan birth of 201–2
deception of: *see* *Dios apate*
deity complains to *see* *plaint in heaven*
plan of 1–3, 26, 98–9, 117, 121, 152 n. 27
role in immortalization 180 n. 189
supplicated by Eos and/or Thetis 63–4,
67, 90
see also Enlil; Jupiter